





LIBRARY
OF THE
UNIVERSITY
OF ILLINOIS



THE PAROCHIAL SYSTEM.

A CHARGE

DELIVERED TO

THE CLERGY

OF THE

DIOCESE OF LONDON,

At his Primary Visitation

IN NOVEMBER 1871.

BY JOHN JACKSON, D.D.,

BISHOP OF LONDON.

London:

WILLIAM SKEFFINGTON, 163, PICCADILLY.

1871.

LONDON :
R. CLAY, SONS, AND TAYLOR, PRINTERS,
BREAD STREET HILL.

A CHARGE, ETC.

DEAR BRETHREN IN THE LORD,

AN illness last year, serious only as a warning, obliged me to postpone for twelve months beyond its usual time the Visitation of this Diocese, and thus enabled me to enlarge my acquaintance with its Clergy and laity and their respective work, and with our difficulties, dangers and needs, before we met together, in this week of united prayer, to review, as far as time permits, the present position of the Church in our Diocese, its failure or success in the past, our hopes, duties and responsibilities for the future.

I could not, indeed, have claimed your indulgence as for one who entered as a stranger into your diocese, having myself spent here many happy years of my ministerial life; but I have keenly felt, and still feel keenly, the need of it for one who has returned to London, under a sense (God grant it may not have been a *mistaken* sense) of

duty which might not be evaded,—in the wane of life, when faculties are no longer plastic to the impulse of new demands and power must needs be husbanded,—to sustain, in days of singular difficulty, a crisis perhaps, in our Church's history, the burden of the greatest diocese in Christendom. Brethren, you have given me your prayers, I know; for your own sake, for the Church's, for mine, let me have them still.

Nor was the difficulty of the position much lessened by the circumstance that I was to occupy the seat of one whose ability and geniality, fairness and kindness, strong sense and wide sympathies, power of work in himself and tact in enlisting the assistance of others, had made his episcopate a worthy sequel to that of his gifted and energetic predecessor. It is true, indeed, that it is comparatively easy to keep in motion machinery which another has framed; and I should be most ungrateful if I did not acknowledge thankfully the wise plans and useful associations which the Archbishop left in operation or prepared. It is true, also, that I have enjoyed, and, by God's mercy, still enjoy, the advantage of his advice as well as of his example. But comparisons must make *themselves*: and you must have missed much, Brethren, which you were accustomed to obtain.

I did not under-estimate the weight of the charge I accepted. Its labour, its responsibilities, its anxieties, are such as I anticipated. But I did not expect,—I had no right to expect,—the all but

universal kindness which I have received from the Clergy and laity of this diocese, not only at first when a welcome is rarely withheld, but after there had been time for disappointment to be felt, and for differences to develope. Differences of opinion there must always be in a national and tolerant Church between the various schools of thought which can fairly include themselves within the compass of its formularies, and therefore there must be such between a Bishop and some of his Clergy; but you have shewn, and I trust I may never forget, that differences do not oblige disunion: and that diversities in doctrine and ritual, even when grave in themselves and anxious as to their results, need not, and therefore ought not, to break the bonds of charity or loosen the ties of brotherly respect and esteem.

It is a result of returning to London after an absence of more than fifteen years spent in a diocese in which the Church's work exists under very different conditions, that the peculiarities of our own position here, as well as the changes which have been taking place in the interval, become more obvious. I am not now referring to the numerous vacancies which death has made during those few years, and the warnings and examples which they suggest to work earnestly each at our own post, while it is yet day. Such warnings and examples are ever about us. Even in my brief episcopate three members of the small Chapter of this Cathedral Church have received their summons: Canon

Melville, one of the most eloquent of preachers and humblest of Christians, who in the height of his popularity, while crowded audiences were listening with hushed attention to his brilliant and thoughtful discourses, maintained unimpaired the simplicity of a child : Archdeacon Hale, the friend and counsellor of Bishop Blomfield, ever sagacious and active in the business of the diocese and of the Societies of the Church, kind, genial and sympathising, with whom has perished a long-stored treasure of ecclesiastical and legal lore : and Dean Mansel, whose powerful and subtle intellect had traversed all systems and grappled with the most formidable problems of mental and moral philosophy, had drawn from the armory which had supplied the Pantheist and the Materialist, weapons to defend the truth, and had proved that it is possible to have mastered the transcendental metaphysics of modern Europe, yet to retain a firm and simple faith in the Gospel.

Such changes, sad as they are, and instructive as they should be, are ever taking place around us and amongst us. Those to which I wish to refer are such as long have been and are still in progress in this diocese in the organization and character of the Church's work, as compared with its normal state in which it still exists in many parts of our Rural dioceses and in small portions of our own. These changes may be briefly characterised as a gradual but great enfeeblement and disintegration of the Parochial system, mainly arising from the enormous and rapid increase of the population in

the metropolis and its unequal distribution, but accelerated also by recent legislation, by variations of social and theological opinion, and, in some degree perhaps, by overstrains put on the principle itself. This is a process which deserves our most anxious consideration, and will form the main subject of my remarks to-day. For the Parochial System is of the essence,—not indeed of a Church, or even of an established Church,—but of a truly National Church: and while it economizes and concentrates the Church's missionary work, it alone secures and makes effective her pastoral ministrations. The decay, therefore, of this system in any Church, or in any part of a Church, not only tends to disqualify it for its position as the Church of the nation, but (which is of far graver import) enfeebles it as the divinely appointed instrument for saving souls and training them for heaven.

By this system the whole country is portioned out into districts containing by hypothesis such a population dwelling on such an area as can be adequately ministered to by the Priest or Parson of the Parish, to whom is committed by the chief Ordinary the cure and government of the souls of the Parishioners of the said Parish, for the discharge of which he is responsible ecclesiastically to the Bishop of his diocese, but in a far higher and more solemn sense to the divine Head and chief Pastor of the Church. According to this ideal each Parishioner should be able to know his Pastor, each Pastor every individual Member of his flock;

and as the Minister has his *duties* spiritual and temporal, and his *rights* to his maintenance and to the general government of the Church and Parish, so have the Parishioners their *rights* to the use of their Parish Church, to the services of public worship in accordance with the laws of the Church and nation, to their Pastor's public and private ministrations, and to a share in the government of the Parish by their representatives the Churchwardens and by their voice in Vestry assembled. They have also their *duties* to perform in maintaining the Church and its services and, where necessary, their Minister, in assisting his efforts for the welfare of his people, and in aiding their poorer brethren, not only under legal obligation but by the exercise of private benevolence.

Such is the ideal: how different is the reality in a large portion of this diocese I need not say. What has become of the rights of Priest and people, and how are their relative duties practicable when 10,000, 20,000, 30,000 souls are under the charge of one or two Clergymen, and supplied with a single Parish Church? There are hundreds of thousands who do not know in what Parish or Ecclesiastical district they dwell—and this from no fault of their Pastor—unless they have learnt it from the rates they pay or from the quarter whither they are sent to seek relief.

The main, and in itself an adequate, cause of this prostration of the Parochial System is sufficiently indicated by the fact, that while the population of

London within the Bills of Mortality was, in 1801, 958,863, it is now, in 1871, 3,251,804. No doubt, by strenuous and continued exertion provision might have been made for the spiritual requirements of this enormous increase as it was taking place. But social evils are rarely felt till they have become serious and inveterate. The first fifteen years of the century were engrossed by foreign wars. The earliest efforts for the provision of new Churches were made, at a cost out of proportion to the results, for large and growing, but not the most needy, populations, such as St. Pancras and St. Marylebone: and by the time that Bishop Blomfield and the energetic laymen who assisted him had succeeded in arousing public attention to the spiritual destitution of Bethnal Green and the densely peopled parishes of the East, the problem of overtaking the accumulated increase of the past and of keeping pace at the same time with the additions made by every succeeding year had become very difficult indeed. The duty, however, of making provision for the spiritual wants of the metropolis has never since been lost sight of: special efforts have been made from time to time: the Diocesan Church Building Society has done valuable work: and during the last seven years a great impulse has been given to the extension of the Church and its ministrations by the Bishop of London's Fund, the most vigorous and successful effort yet made, whether we consider the amount of money raised, the unwearied and judicious

labour expended upon it, not by Clergy only, but especially by laymen of all ranks and every shade of opinion, or the wisdom with which it has succeeded, not in building Churches merely, but, in conjunction with our invaluable Diocesan Home Mission, reconstructing, to some extent at least, the lost Parochial System, by forming gradually missionary districts into Ecclesiastical Parishes. The Fund has granted since the last Visitation £58,435 for Churches and Church sites, £31,033 for Schools, £58,571 for stipends, making a total of £148,039: and it has been in no small degree instrumental in stimulating the expenditure from other sources in the same period of £608,574 on Church building and restoration, and of £240,701 on Schools and Mission Houses, making together a sum of £849,275.¹ For the good work thus done my thanks are due first to God who prompted it, and next to the energy and forethought of my Predecessor and to the self-denying exertions of those who have so liberally and perseveringly laboured it out.

The conclusion of another decennial period makes it desirable to review our present position, to survey the extent of the deficiency still to be dealt with, and to see what progress, if any, has been made towards the restoration of the Parochial System by the supply of additional Churches, Clergy and manageable districts. This we can do now only roughly and approximately. Time

¹ Appendix A.

will not admit of detail; nor will the returns of the Census as regards separate Parishes and Ecclesiastical districts be available before next year.

During this decennial period, and indeed since the last Visitation, the area of our diocese has been diminished by the transfer of the Deaneries of Greenwich, Woolwich and Barking to the diocese of Rochester. The population thus transferred is reckoned at above 300,000,¹ and the Parishes are for the most part poor and populous. Now the population of the *present* diocese of London—*i.e.* of Middlesex with the Deaneries in Surrey of Newington and Barnes, is, by the Census lately taken, 2,655,408, being an increase in the ten years of 349,441. This increase, then, is nearly balanced by the numbers transferred to Rochester: and the population of the diocese may, for practical purposes, be considered to be but 50,000 more than it was, when Bishop Tait drew attention to its spiritual destitution in his Visitation in 1862. We have, therefore, the cheering result that a large proportion of what has been effected since that date, within the contracted area of the diocese, may be reckoned as gain. It appears that in the period of ten years, 102 new Ecclesiastical districts have been legally constituted² (besides 11 in Parishes transferred to

¹ The Bishop of Rochester informs me that he considers the population transferred to him was nearly 340,000. If so, our relative gain upon the spiritual wants of the diocese as it is, is greater than I have ventured to calculate.

² Appendix B.

Rochester), thirteen of which have at present only temporary or unfinished Churches. The remaining 89 have duly consecrated Churches; and 2 others are nearly ready for consecration. The number of Ecclesiastical districts therefore, in which the Parochial System is at least partially re-established, is an increase of much over one-fourth, or 30 per cent., while the increase of the population which we have to provide for is only 15 per cent. There have been 89 new Churches consecrated in the same period, and 14 which have been completed or enlarged. There are besides 28 Temporary Churches or Mission Houses built or rented, to most of which conventional districts are assigned, and for many of which funds for erecting permanent Churches are being raised. Nor must we omit, as an important addition to the provision for public worship and the preaching of the Word, 39 Chapels of Ease and Proprietary Chapels, although, as their Ministers have no cure of souls, they do not fall strictly within the contents of the Parochial System. The number of Clergy beneficed or licensed in the diocese has increased from 888 in 1861 and 1,002 in 1866 to 1,081 at the present Visitation.

It was calculated on the Census of 1861 that additional spiritual provision was needed for a million of souls; and that such provision ought to be made at the rate of 1 Church and 2 Clergymen for every 4,000. Under the normal conditions of the Parochial System this calculation is far from excessive: but after making due allowance for the

large and numerous places of worship of non-conformist bodies (as practically we must and ought, though theoretically bound as a National Church to supply Church room for all who have a right to it), experience seems to have led to the opinion, that under the exceptional circumstances of the population of the Metropolis, its migratory character in some districts and the large number of Jews and foreigners in others, the Church of England will have fairly discharged her duty by providing one Church for every 6,000, assuming that the services of the Church are supplemented ordinarily by schoolroom, mission room, or other like ministrations. On this ratio we shall have succeeded during the decennial period, besides providing for the accruing increase of population, in supplying rather more than one-half of the Churches needed, and *so far* in meeting the spiritual destitution of one-half of the million bequeathed to us by the neglect of the past. But even in this branch of work to be done, and on this imperfect scale, not only sustained, but much increased, exertion will be needed. As there seems no reason at present to anticipate a check on the rate of the growth of the Metropolis, the *additions* of each year will require 6 new Churches ; so that if this decennial period is successfully to overtake the arrears still remaining over from the last, Churches should be completed at the rate of 14 yearly, instead of 9, the average hitherto.

But essential as is a sufficient provision of

Churches for the restoration of the Parochial system and the evangelization of this enormous diocese, far more important is the living voice of the Minister of the Gospel,—a due supply of men qualified, commissioned and bound to preach the word and administer the Sacraments, and to be “instant in season and out of season” to win souls to Christ. And here I do not think that any deductions should be made from the calculations on which the Bishop of London’s Fund was based. One Clergyman for every 2,000 is the lowest ratio,—much indeed too low,—if pastoral work is to be a reality, and every Parishioner is to have the opportunity, as in theory he has the right, of the personal counsel of his Minister. We are very far from this. The number of Clergy in the actual diocese has indeed increased in the decennial period from 888 to 1,081: but even now, if the population were equally divided among all the Clergy ministering in it, each man’s pastoral charge would be 2,500. As it is, after deducting a large proportion of the City Benefices of which the resident population is now very small, and a few country parishes, the average in the remaining districts is far beyond this. According to the returns made to me last year, which it has not yet been possible to check by the results of the Census, the *average* proportion of Clergy to the people under their charge in 79 of the most populous Parishes was but one to every 4,244, while there were 3 cases among them of 1 to

7,000, 2 of 1 to 8,000, 1 of 1 to 10,000, and one of but 1 to 11,000. For these 79 Parishes alone almost 300 additional Clergy would be needed in order that each 2,000 of the population might have one Pastor's undivided care. Here then is a deficiency of serious magnitude, and one far more difficult to supply than that of Churches, involving, as it does, the requirement of a further income of at the very least £60,000 per annum. For some portion of this sum we may look, no doubt, to the Ecclesiastical Commission to which this diocese is already deeply indebted, and from which we have received during the decennial period just closed, grants for the endowment of Benefices or stipends of Curates equal to a capital sum of one million of money or an annual payment of £30,000 a year, to which must be added above £70,000 expended chiefly in the erection of Parsonage Houses and the cost of providing their sites, and also Benefactions from non-ecclesiastical sources of nearly equal amount made to the Commission within the same period.¹ The Bishop of London's Fund and the Diocesan Home Mission may be enabled, I earnestly trust, not only to maintain but to increase their expenditure for the

¹ The Common Fund of the Ecclesiastical Commission to which these important results are due, was founded in 1840 mainly on the advice of Bishop Blomfield; and they justify the prediction which he uttered when the measure was most warmly controvorted, "They blame me now, but they will hereafter confess that these very measures have been the saving of the Church."—*Memoir by the Rev. Alfred Blomfield*, i. 227.

employment of Missionary Clergy, to break up the fallow ground more effectually in our still enormous parishes, and to work up portions into independent Ecclesiastical districts. From the Additional Curates and Pastoral Aid Societies we cannot expect a larger proportion from their present incomes than they already contribute to our diocese; though they ought to be relieved by the Parishioners of many of our less destitute parishes of the grants they are making to these, and set free to bestow them on districts where there are none to help. But it is the laity of the Church on whom we must learn to depend, much more generally and systematically than we have hitherto done, for the support of additional Clergy. It is an unfortunate, though a natural result of our position as an established Church, that as the maintenance of the Clergy is, as the rule, provided by endowment, the people have not felt the necessity nor recognized the duty of supporting the Ministry of the word and sacraments in those exceptional though by no means uncommon cases, where, as in this Metropolis, the population has rapidly and far outgrown the provision which has been made, or by any possibility can be obtained, by endowment. And it is a kindred result, that we of the Clergy shrink from enforcing the duty, as if it were our own interest for which we should be pleading. And yet if it is a duty,—as surely it is,—we are bound to inculcate it on our people, for whom it must be a sin to neglect it and a privilege

to discharge it: nor is it for the Clergy that we plead, but for those thousands of souls for whose spiritual needs a ministry is required which can be supported from no other source. It is, indeed, becoming more and more evident, that if a staff of Clergy is to be maintained in this diocese at all adequate to cope with its requirements, it must be by a much more earnest, general, and systematic appeal to the laity of all ranks: and I trust that there will soon be no Parish, rich or poor, in which a proportionately ample fund is not raised yearly for the support of additional Clergy, either for the work of the Parish itself, or for that of more destitute districts.

I should regret, indeed, if in any case the maintenance of the Incumbent of a Parish or district were left entirely or mainly to voluntary sources. The Weekly Offertory or the fees and oblations of the people afford too precarious an income for him whose Parish is to be his home, and who, as settled there, ought to be free from family anxieties and distracting cares: nor, as a matter of experience, can these sources be relied on for a sufficient and permanent income, save in a few exceptional cases and in wealthy neighbourhoods: but to supply him or assist him with the stipends of his Curates, the Incumbent ought to be able to look to such offerings, and not in vain.

And here I must venture to touch on the subject of pew rents, against which a crusade has been preached of late by many good and earnest men,

and which they object to, not merely as inexpedient and illegal, but almost as a kind of sacrilege and trafficking with holy things. They have unfortunately met sometimes with a success which they would be the first to deplore; and have injected conscientious scruples against the payment of pew rents into the minds of some who have no scruple at all in allowing their Clergyman and family to starve for want of them. This movement has truth for its base. Few practices have done more to dislocate the Parochial System and to drive the working classes from our Churches in town and country, than that of appropriating, whether for money or not, all the best parts of the Church and the well-built and comfortable pews to the wealthy, while the poor are left to seat themselves as they may, in remote corners or on a few bare benches. And it is true that every Parishioner has equally his common law right to a seat in his Parish Church. But it is equally true that it is the duty of the Churchwardens to seat every Parishioner who claims his right, and that it has long been the practice in our Church, which founds the Parish itself on the Household, to encourage and enable husbands and wives, parents and children to kneel and pray together. Hence, in the normal state of a Parish, all the seats in the Church are appropriated by the Churchwardens to all the families in the Parish, whether they be rich or poor. But we have to deal now with an altogether abnormal state, where the Church is far too

small to contain all the Parishioners, and where many of the Parishioners, from whatever cause, have no desire to attend their Parish Church. What in such case is the wisest and most just course? ‘To have all the seats free and unappropriated,’ we are told, ‘and to allow the Parishioners to seat themselves as they please.’ And no doubt there are districts, sometimes of the very rich, more often of the very poor, where such an arrangement is expedient. But in general it interferes, as much as over-appropriation, with the Parochial System in practice, and is almost as alien to it in principle.

In the first place, there are many,—in most places the large majority,—who desire to have fixed places in their Church; who like to be sure that when they attend divine worship with their families, they and their wife and children may kneel together; who are unwilling that those who are feeble in health shall be precluded altogether from the services of the Church, or shall be obliged to incur the additional fatigue of a much earlier attendance to secure a seat; and who are not free from the weakness, if such it is, of being aided in their devotions by the associations of place, and of being able to pray and listen better where they have prayed and listened long. Are such feelings unreasonable? At any rate they are very general, and we shall be wise to consider them. They who cannot obtain in their Parish Church what they feel the need of, and what in the ideal of the Parish system they are entitled to, will seek it

elsewhere: and as we have alienated the working classes from our Churches by the appropriation to others of all the best constructed and best placed seats, so shall we alienate some of the upper and most of the great middle class,—who have the same right to be considered, though no more, than their poorer brethren,—by attempting to force upon them free and open Churches. Nay among the poor themselves there are many (as is found by experience in some parts of the metropolis) who will gladly pay a small rent in order to secure a seat to resort to, which they may call their own. On the other hand the free and open Church is unsuited to the Parochial System, at least in the midst of large populations divided into various Parishes and districts, because it fails to secure the rights of Parishioners. It is as free and open to others as to them. And in proportion as the Preacher is eloquent and attractive, or the ritual beautiful or novel, the Parishioners for whose sake the Church was built and perhaps endowed, and *whose* souls (not those of others) have been entrusted to their Pastor's care, are excluded by strangers whom curiosity impels, or freedom from home duties enables, to arrive earlier than is possible to them. It has been my experience, in my Episcopate, to have been applied to several times by Church-wardens for authority to appropriate seats in a free and open Church, in order to secure Parishioners a place in the Parish Church which non-parishioners habitually occupied.

On the whole I am of opinion, in a state of things confessedly and for the present hopelessly abnormal, and making allowance for exceptional cases and for the wishes in some instances of Parishioners themselves, that the nearest approach we can make ordinarily to the restoration of the Parochial System in this respect, is by the appropriation to the Parishioners of a certain number of seats proportionate to the character of the district, and the leaving free and unappropriated all the rest,—in general not less than one-half,—equally well built, equally well situated, and only distinguished from the rest by having no privilege of pre-occupation. And if so, I am quite unable to see any objection in principle to requiring from those who ask for and obtain that privilege, a certain payment applicable to the maintenance of the Incumbent, or even to the expenses of public worship. The Parishioners in unendowed or ill-endowed districts are bound to support their Minister: and there seems nothing either unfair on those who pay, or derogatory to him who receives, in throwing the weightiest portion of the charge on those who have accepted an exceptional advantage. This principle has long been admitted by the Legislature which has sanctioned and regulated the taking of pew rents: and though it must be admitted that it has been too often so applied as to make some of our Churches the property of the rich, and no place for the poor, it would be equally unreasonable and unwise to abandon a practice which is capable of equitable regulation, which is

practically at least as compatible with the true Parochial System as is that of free and open Churches, on which a very large proportion of the incomes of the Clergy of this diocese now depends, and from which some portion at least of the great increase of endowment which we urgently need for the future may be most readily obtained.

I must add, before I leave the subject, my earnest hope that, in all those parishes in which the Church has, under the pew system as formerly administered, been virtually closed against the poor, immediate efforts may be made, if not made already, to supply *them* also with facilities for public worship, for the preached word and the Sacraments. 'There are wealthy parishes in which the spiritual advantages of the working class are far less than in many of the poorest. And you will not remedy this evil, usually, by altering your present Churches, by lowering the pews, removing their doors or even abolishing the rents. All this may be improvement. It may please the present worshippers in your Church, or it may displease and alienate them. But it will not draw those whom you wish to reach. All old associations, all their prejudices are against it. It never was their Church and it never will be. You must provide them their own place of worship, be it schoolroom, or—much better—chapel or Church. You must give them shorter services and usually a different style of preaching. And you must appeal earnestly to your wealthier Parishioners for the means for erecting the requi-

site buildings and maintaining the additional services. I do not think that such an appeal will at the present day often be made in vain. The work has already been done in some great parishes: it is doing in others. It will soon be effected, I trust, in all.

A large increase of the number of the Clergy of the diocese, although an object to be kept steadily before us, as essential to the restoration of the Parochial System and to the evangelization of the masses of the population, can only be effected gradually and perhaps slowly. Meanwhile I thankfully observe a much larger amount of lay help given to the Pastor in his work than was usually found when I left this diocese eighteen years ago,—help which no increase in the number of the Clergy would allow us to dispense with, and which is all-important in our present paucity. At that date, indeed, we had many of us—I can speak gratefully for myself—the aid of many earnest and judicious district Visitors and of some excellent Sunday School teachers; and the value of paid Scripture Readers and other lay agents was generally recognized: but the band of lay helpers from all ranks and of both sexes has now largely increased; hospitals and workhouses are visited; schools, clothing clubs and mothers' meetings sustained: and, by much self-sacrifice of time and toil, the poor of the east of the metropolis are visited and cheered by the rich and noble of the west. All this—though much more is needed—is an advance in the right direction. An im-

portant attempt, too, has been made to extend and organize lay agency in the Church's work, to direct it when necessary, and to create a feeling of sympathy, brotherhood, and mutual intercession among those engaged in it, by the institution of the Lay Helpers' Association, which now carries on its roll the names of 1,457 Members. I owe my warmest thanks to those who have so zealously conducted this movement. But besides the assistance thus rendered in the ordinary work of Christian charity, we have availed ourselves in this diocese of the resolutions agreed to by the Bishops in 1866 with regard to the employment of Lay Readers; and I have had much satisfaction in commissioning, after special prayer, being first duly certified of their piety, soundness in the faith and knowledge of the Scriptures, 31 laymen to act under their respective Clergymen in visiting and reading to the sick and infirm, and in conducting religious services in schoolrooms or other unconsecrated buildings.

Another form of lay help which, if it has not altogether sprung into existence, has greatly extended since the date to which I am looking back, is the institution of Sisterhoods. And here, if I am obliged at all to qualify the expression of my satisfaction, it is from no want of the truest appreciation of the devoted lives and labours of the ladies who, in these various societies, are discharging with a gentle zeal beyond my praise all the offices of Christian charity. Such offices are

especially women's work: nor can there be any reason why women, bound by no family ties and claimed by no family duties, should not unite together for the more systematic and effectual discharge of such offices, for mutual aid and encouragement, and for united prayer. For such a community a distinctive dress may be useful, though perhaps not necessary, and a distinctive name. Sisterhoods thus framed and for these objects I gladly welcome as valuable auxiliaries to the Church's work. But I cannot forget that the *family* is God's institution; all such communities are but man's: and I am jealous lest the human creation should usurp the dues of the Divine ordinance. On this account I must hold all vows unlawful. The very imposition of a vow implies the possibility of a conflict of duties: and the force of the vow is to bind the conscience to prefer the humanly imposed duty to that which is inherent in the institution of God. It must be borne in mind, too, that all artificial communities, however justifiable and useful, have their peculiar tendencies and dangers: and it is not surprising, if women severed from the duties, affections and natural dependence of family life, as well as from the innocent amusements of society, should develope an inclination towards an ascetic discipline, a surrender of conscience and will to the direction of others, the vanity of an eccentric dress and the excitement of an excessive ritual. All such tendencies should be judiciously and gently checked,—never encouraged,—by those who have to

control or advise sisterhoods, if they would not run the risk of aiding or allowing the healthy life of religion to degenerate into a narrow, feeble though excited pietism. One word more before quitting this subject. In the singular reaction towards mediæval tastes and practices which has found a place in the midst of—perhaps on account of—the material progress and intellectual rationalism of the nineteenth century, we ought not perhaps to be surprised if attempts are made or contemplated to introduce the recluse life among members of the Church of England. The attempt, no doubt, will fail on trial. And ought it not to fail? Is there in the Gospel one single precept for the recluse life? one single example of it? The Apostles and Evangelists were not recluse: Tryphena and Tryphosa, & the beloved Persis, these were not recluse. Our Lord's prayer for His own was not that His Father would take them out of the world, but that He would keep them from its evil. In the world we have each our work to do to be done in an unworldly spirit. If freed from the necessity of labouring for ourselves and families, we have yet a thousand opportunities, each involving an obligation because sent by God, of relieving, instructing, benefiting others. To them are due the time, strength, ability and means not needed for our own allotted task; and we have no right, withdrawing with these powers of usefulness into a seclusion where they cannot be exercised, under the idea, which for the most part proves delusive, of living

there in closer communion with God, to say to our afflicted brother, “ It is Corban, by whatsoever thou mightest be profited by me.”

But to return. One most valuable result of the Parochial System, and, in its turn, one most valuable element of it, has been the establishment of our Church Schools. But for the Parish they never could have multiplied since the beginning of the century, till eight-tenths of all the children under primary instruction were in them: the Schools, on the other hand, have done much to attach to the Parish and its Church both those who supported them and those who have been taught in them. This system has now received a rude shock. Fail, no doubt, it did to some extent at both its extremities. In very large populations, it was sometimes unable to supply sufficient schools, but oftener unable to bring the children into them: in very small ones it was not possible to maintain efficient schools excepting at a cost out of proportion to the occasion and the results. There came in also the religious difficulty, so formidable in theory, so insignificant in practice, which, many will now admit, was not always dealt with so wisely as it might have been. The consequence was the Act of last year, which, in order to make primary education universal and more efficient, is to supplement by rate built and rate supported undenominational schools—and which, while supplementing, threatens to supplant—the denominational Schools of our Parishes. The question,

however, whether our Parochial Schools ought to be maintained, notwithstanding and together with, the system thus introduced, has received an unequivocal answer. Never has so powerful an impulse been given to the building and enlargement of denominational, and especially of Church, Schools as by the Elementary Education Act of 1870. In some districts, no doubt, the effort which has been made to build new Church Schools and to enlarge old ones, has been aided to a certain extent by the desire to retain local management and to exclude that of a Board; but with every allowance made for this motive, the large sums raised for Schools within the last twelve months, may be taken to measure the preference of the country for a distinctively religious education over one which must be creedless, and may be only secular. In our own diocese, this indication of a healthy feeling as to the importance of definite religious teaching is very clear and satisfactory. For the great proportion of it, for all the metropolitan district, there must be a school board and a school rate; and all voluntary contributions for schools must now be over and above what each rate-payer is obliged to pay for the same object. All such voluntary contributions, therefore, must be due to a conviction, that it is the duty of Churchmen to secure not education only, but a religious education, for the children of those who will accept it. It is very satisfactory, therefore, to know that the efforts made in this diocese for building and enlarging

Church Schools within the last twelve months have exceeded very greatly those of any preceding year. The sum expended on this object cannot yet be ascertained: but some estimate may be suggested by the fact that the grants in aid of voluntary contributions, to which they bear of course a very small proportion, made to us by the National Society, amounted to £7,705; by the Christian Knowledge Society to £1,080; and by the Bishop of London's Fund to £29,219.

It still remains, however, a question not free from anxiety, how far we shall be able to maintain our Parochial Schools, when the pressure of the Education rate begins to be felt, and when the Board Schools become an object of public interest, as they must from their novelty and from the importance of the experiment in itself and in its results. And here let me be allowed to entreat the managers of Church Schools never to transfer their school to the School Board unless under the pressure of absolute necessity; and in that case to be careful to secure the use of the premises whenever not required for school purposes, for their Sunday School and other parochial uses. It is impossible that such religious instruction as can be given under the regulations of a Board School, even when supplemented by our own Sunday School and other additional teaching, can adequately supply the sound religious education which it is the object and endeavour of our parochial schools to give. Every effort then should be made to keep our schools in our own

hands. In some cases it may be necessary to raise the rate of payment by the children : in all cases it will be important that the secular teaching shall be made as efficient as possible : but the essential conditions of the continued existence of our Church Schools are, that the religious instruction in them is sufficient and sound, and that there is adequate guarantee and evidence that it is so. The only ground on which we can ask and expect the contributions of those who are obliged also to contribute by rate to Board Schools, is that in our schools that sound religious instruction is given which the Board Schools cannot give. Not only then must such religious instruction be really and effectively given, —which can only be done (especially under existing circumstances, when the attention of the Master and Mistress is liable to be much diverted from it by the importance and pecuniary results attached to the secular teaching) by the personal exertions of the Clergymen of the Parish,—but we must be able to certify the subscribers that it *is* given, which can only be done, as far as I can perceive, by a system of careful, candid and judicious inspection. Inspection of such a character, I am happy to believe, we have provided for our diocese : and I look confidently to you, my Reverend Brethren, as well to maintain and improve the religious teaching in your Schools by your own assistance and superintendence, as, by interesting your Parishioners in the work and obtaining their contributions, to enable the Diocesan Board of

Education to stimulate and encourage the teachers by kind yet accurate inspection, and, if possible, by the bestowal of well-deserved rewards.

The main cause of the failure of the Parochial System in our diocese is of course, as we have said, the rapid increase of population. But it may fail also from lack of population. The Pastor may not have a flock, nor his Church a congregation. And such is actually the case in many Parishes within the City of London, in which the inhabitants have decreased by above 37,000,—nearly one-third,—since the preceding Census. In most of these Parishes, too, even the semblance of the Parochial System is destroyed by the non-residence of the Incumbent. It is true that in many there is no house or no fit house of residence; and it is also true that in several cases the Incumbent is most unwillingly absent under the pressure of ill-health. But there remain still instances enough of non-residence, without any such valid excuse, to occasion scandal and not unreasonable complaint. In our Church no Clergyman is obliged to accept the cure of a Parish; and if he does accept it, it is voluntarily with all its obligations. Of these one of the most obvious and most essential to the Parochial System is, that he and his family should live among his people; an obligation which is not fulfilled or compensated for, by an occasional or even a daily visit, while the home, the very centre and heart of all good works in a normal parish, is far away. One thing, however, is clear; if the population of a

Parish is so small, or its circumstances such, that it does not require a resident Clergyman, while there are in its close neighbourhood thousands for whom no resident Clergyman is provided, it can scarcely be a question whether the time is not come when the Legislature should readjust the supply to the demand, and should remove the endowments from spots where there are not souls enough to need a separate Pastor, to districts where there are poor and ignorant multitudes destitute of a Pastor's care. The principle of such a readjustment, indeed, was admitted eleven years back, at a time when the population of the City was one-third greater than it now is ; but the Union of Benefices Act¹ was framed with a machinery so weak at once and so cumbrous, that although much time and labour have been bestowed upon attempts to apply it, the first Church erected under its provisions in a populous district, is not yet ready for consecration, and only three more schemes of union have up to this time received the Royal assent. It is much to be hoped that another Session of Parliament will not pass without the enactment of some measure, which while it provides equitably for the rights and compensation of all parties to whom they are due, will no longer arm each claimant with a veto, enabling him thus to extort concessions which maim the benefits of the Union, or to stop a transfer in which the spiritual interests of thousands are concerned. It will be an important step towards the

¹ 23 and 24 Vic. c. 142.

restoration of the Parochial System, if while the Parishes of the City itself are so reconstituted as to require and secure a resident Incumbent, the same blessing can by the same means be extended to many a populous district beyond its bounds.

Another hindrance, not indeed, strictly speaking, to the Parochial System itself, but to some of its most important duties and advantages, arises from the unequal distribution of rich and poor in different parts of the metropolis. In the normal Parish the various ranks of social life are found together,—not of course always in the same proportions,—but so as in each to give the poor the advantage of neighbours who can help, and to afford to the more prosperous the opportunity of discharging duties imperative on every disciple of the Lord Jesus Christ,—visiting the sick, instructing the ignorant, relieving the distressed. But in London the classes are separated, not only in habits, occupations and interests, but to a large extent, by locality: and although there are Parishes in which the proportion between them is fairly maintained, there are others in which the disparity is very great. Whole districts in St. George's, in Kensington and Bayswater, may have scarcely any poor to visit; whole districts in Bethnal Green, Stepney and St. George's in the East have, without doubt, very few to visit the poor. Attempts have been made to remedy this inequality, by the adoption by some of the wealthier parishes of some of the more

destitute, in order that those who have leisure and means in the one may find the opportunity of employing them for their brethren's good in the other. The idea is admirable, and it has been in a few instances not unsuccessfully realized. But it must be acted upon much more generally, if we are in earnest to redress the evils which arise from massing the poor in districts remote from those who ought to care for them and help them, and to restore, as far as may be, in this Metropolis, that most valuable but almost vanishing feature of the Parochial System, by which duty and opportunity are linked together, and the way is made plain for doing what every one, according to his ability, is bound to do. Most gladly shall I be the medium of establishing such a communication of mutual benefit between districts which need help and districts able to help them. And I would ask you, in all seriousness, my Reverend Brethren, whether we are all of us doing justice to ourselves and to our people, by urging sufficiently the duty of personal exertion and self-denial in good works, which, if there be truth in our Lord's words and in the shadowing forth of the day of judgment by the hand of the great Judge Himself, is the very test which will discriminate then between the saved and lost? There are tens of thousands of men and women, respectable in their lives and respected, worshippers in our Churches, and dwellers in homes replete with comfort, elegance, luxury, who do absolutely

nothing and give next to nothing, in discharge of those offices of charity which, done or not done to His brethren, are acknowledged as done or reckoned as not done, to the divine Saviour Himself. And these tens of thousands are among the souls committed to our care.

Nor can I forbear adding, though diverging slightly from my course, that these duties of Christian charity are at the same time the dictates of the wisest policy. The worst peril of the near future is the alienation of classes. The great gulph widens, and disruption appears imminent. In rural districts, indeed, old associations, more frequent personal intercourse, some community of interest, still link the grades of society together: but in large towns, and especially in this metropolis, the separation is ever going on between labour and capital, employers and employed, rich and poor. Distance causes misapprehension and exaggerates differences. The brotherhood of humanity is lost in the narrower but more energetic brotherhood of classes. Interests, in reality closely connected, viewed from one side only, appear antagonistic. Inequalities are felt as injustice, and misfortunes resented as wrongs. And the classes of society on whose interdependence and mutual interchange of offices depend the well-being of each part and the stability of the whole,—disunited in sympathies, opposed, as is imagined, in interests, and drawn together by none of the personal intercourse which is stronger

than theoretical differences,—stand in peril of mutually destructive hostility.

It is our special duty, my Reverend Brethren, as we have special opportunities, to mitigate, if we cannot cure this evil :—mainly, no doubt, by preaching faithfully to rich and poor alike that Gospel which alone can divest riches of their perils or support poverty through its temptations ; which alone can solve the perplexed enigma of the inequalities of men's lot ; and which alone reveals and establishes the only brotherhood which can bind regenerate humanity into one,—the oneness of faith hope and charity, of privilege here, of inheritance hereafter, —in the one body of the Lord Jesus Christ. But it is also our duty to give practical effect to this teaching by urging, eliciting and directing, as far as possible, the exercise of personal good offices by the one class towards the other, by interesting the rich in the well-being, difficulties and wants of the poor, and by assisting them to make that interest practical ; and thus by linking again the broken chain, to enable the spark of charity, the current of brotherly love, to circulate more freely between the extremities of the social system, and to rekindle a feeling that the many members are yet one body. But our diocese is ill organized for such a work. The classes are often locally separate as well as socially. And therefore it is necessary to its success to depart from the letter of the Parochial System in order to secure its spirit ; and to engage those who are living in more wealthy districts to

charge themselves with the wants and welfare of the distant poor. The labour of course is greater and calls for more self-denial. But the work can be done: it is done by some of the noblest and gentlest in the land. Nor is it without its effect and blessing. Each visit of sympathy breaks down some prejudice and clears away some misapprehension. It helps the one class to feel, that in the other, which it had looked upon with dislike and envy, there are brothers' and sisters' hearts able to sympathise and ready to help. And it may well be doubted whether any legislation can do so much to draw together the disunited members of the body politic as the life of a man of education and station, of strong sense and a large heart, spent among his poorer fellow-men, studying amidst its facts the problems of their position,—how to raise without enfeebling, to relieve without pauperizing, to aid by teaching how to aid themselves,—a life, in a word, like the short life of Edward Denison.

There is one more cause of the decadence of the Parochial System which I must not pass by; though to pursue it we must traverse delicate ground. I do not hesitate on that account. You would far more readily, I know, forgive me a frank expression of opinion, however much it might prove to differ from your own, than a timid reticence on subjects which, in my judgment, it is important that we should consider together. The cause to which I refer is the gradual decay of the rights of the laity in the Parish, and the consequent and unconscious

extension of the autocracy of the Clergy. This cause has been long in operation, and is by no means confined to our own diocese; though here the breaking up of Parishes into Ecclesiastical districts under the provisions of the Church Building Acts has perhaps accelerated the process of throwing the old machinery out of gear, and substituting the congregation for the Parish. In the normal Parish every layman had his rights and his duties; his right to the use of the Parish Church and Churchyard, to the services of the Church and the ministrations of the word and Sacraments in the degree and manner prescribed by law, and to the Pastoral Offices of his Parish Priest: his duties to maintain the Church, Churchyard, and services; to contribute at least by dues and offerings to the support of the Ministry; and to assist his Clergyman in his works of charity and usefulness. These rights were protected and some of these duties discharged by the Vestry, the true Parochial Council, and by the aid of the Churchwardens, who, though the Bishop's Officers, are the representatives and executive of the Parish. The symmetry and strength of the system, indeed, had long been impaired by the growth of nonconformity, when a proportion of the Parishioners began rarely to claim their rights, and unwillingly, if at all, to perform their duties: but it was maimed and almost destroyed in many populous Parishes by the refusal or relinquishment of Church rates even before their compulsory payment had been annulled

by law. Thenceforth the Vestry ceased properly to represent the Parish in Church matters. It is confined more and more to secular business: or if it does interfere in anything belonging to the fabric or the services of the Church, its interference is not unnaturally resented by the congregation, as proceeding from a body, which, *as such*, neither participates in its ordinances nor contributes to its support. Meanwhile, in some Ecclesiastical districts the Churchwardens are appointed and the business transacted by the renters of pews, not by the inhabitants of the district.¹

The result is a weakening of the ties, and a serious disturbance of the relations, between the Incumbent and the Parish. The former, freed from all kind of control on the part of his Parishioners, loses also much of their support: the Parishioners, having no longer rights, feel little interest in their duties. They may, or they may not belong to a congregation, and the congregation is practically the Church. And in a congregation the Minister may be, and often is, autocratic. For in the midst of large populations congregations may be gathered from the neighbourhood or even from a distance, and not from the Parish: indeed by such congregations Parishioners may even be excluded from their own Church. And this process takes place very nearly in proportion as the services or the teaching diverge from the ordinary standard of each in the Church of England;

¹ 1 & 2 Will. IV., c. 38.

from the traditional observance of the rubries or the received interpretation of the Articles and formularies. Extreme mediæval ritual or extreme puritanical carelessness; doctrines which verge on the decrees of Trent, or reach the sternest conclusions of Calvin, or are imbued with the latest speculations of rationalism, have each their attraction for certain minds: and he who has in any of these ways alienated his parishioners for whose souls he is responsible, and sent them, sorrowful or indignant, to worship and to learn elsewhere, may yet with entire impunity pursue his own course, and may even point in justification to a well-filled Church and, perhaps, to the zeal and liberality of interested and attached followers. With entire impunity *here*; but is there not a very solemn question which suggests itself? Are *these* the souls committed to his care? And what is being done for the souls of the parishioners of his Parish,—the souls specially and solely solemnly entrusted to him, and for whom he must render his account when the Chief Shepherd shall appear? It is a good work when the Incumbent of a Parish which has very few inhabitants, succeeds by the earnest fidelity of his teaching and the heartiness of his services in drawing together a large and attached congregation from that numerous class in London who have no parochial assistance and perhaps no room in their own Churches; but that Pastor who has disregarded the feelings of his own people, and driven them away from their own Church, however he may have

filled their places with others more influential possibly in station or by intelligence,—if there be any reality in the Parochial System or any meaning in the solemn words of Institution,—has surely missed his mark, and marred the very work which was given him to do.

But the Parishioners have no redress. Their Incumbent's concern is with his congregation: and his congregation agrees with him. The Church-wardens may, perhaps, apply to the Bishop: but the Bishop can do little to help them. It would be an imperfect and uncandid analysis of the enfeeblement of the Parochial System which took no account of the practical diminution of Episcopal authority during the past forty years: and this from no fault of the Bishops themselves. I say this deliberately and without hesitation. No one, indeed, can be more conscious than he who addresses you of manifold deficiencies for and in the discharge of the Office which by the inscrutable providence of God he has been called to fill: and thankful he is to believe that among those whom he addresses there are many more highly qualified than himself to fill it: but apart from self, whose individual defects ought not in justice seriously to affect the estimate of the whole body, and allowing for the different gifts given in different proportions to different men, I dare to affirm that in no period of the same length has the Church of England possessed a bench of Bishops more deserving of respect, esteem and deference from their learning, piety,

consistency of life, moderation and earnestness, and activity in the discharge of their duties. The causes of the weakening of their authority must in fairness be looked for elsewhere. And they may be found partly in alterations of law; principally in the modifications in the idea of moral obligation which have been taking place in various degrees in all strata of society and in all schools of thought. There is no doubt that, previous to the issue of the Royal Commission in 1830 and the consequent legislation, the laws of Ecclesiastical discipline were in a vague, cumbrous and unsatisfactory state. But their very vagueness was in some sort their strength. Bishops had coercive jurisdiction, but the limits were not very clearly defined. Their monitions were supposed (whether rightly or wrongly I am not now considering) to have the force of law. They were seldom issued; but the opinion of their legal vigour, if issued, gave weight not only to the Bishop's formal directions, but even to the informal expression of his wish. But when the Act of 1 & 2 Vic. cap. 106 had defined the law of pluralities, residence and the relations of Incumbent and Curate, and the Clergy Discipline Act¹ had provided a machinery for dealing with offences against the laws Ecclesiastical, legal obligation to obedience began to be measured by these two statutes, the latter especially. The Bishop's authority was looked upon as corrective rather than directive; as confined to the punishment of offences instead of in-

¹ 3 and 4 Vic. cap. 86.

cluding monition to duties. The *onus probandi* was shifted. Instead of requiring compliance with his monitions unless shown to be unlawful, he was to require proof that the law had been broken. Not charges of erroneous doctrine, merely, or of moral offences, but complaints of neglect of minor duties or slight alterations of ritual had, it was supposed, to be dealt with by the legal machinery provided; and Churchwardens and Parishioners preferred to leave what they yet considered to be their wrongs, unredressed, rather than seek a remedy by a long, uncertain and expensive suit at law.

But this cause would not have been so extensively operative, were there not another running parallel with it of more subtle and pervading force,—the change which has been silently taking place amongst us in the ideas of moral obligation. These ideas at any given period are, for the most part, governed or at least modified by what is, or has lately been, the dominant philosophy of the greatest and most influential thinkers of the age. “The metaphysics of the few,” if I may borrow some sentences from a Charge delivered by me just ten years ago in another chair, “permeating by degrees the poetry, the history and the popular literature of the day, reaches at length the theology and morality of the many. In a neighbouring country, a system, or rather systems, of mental philosophy (themselves a reaction from the philosophy of sensation dominant in the last century), had long been forming, and conflicting, and

moulding public opinion. In the midst of great divergences and contradictions, and arriving at the same result by different roads, these systems agreed in exalting the subjective above the objective, the *ego* above the *non ego*, the conscious self above all that is not the conscious self. Whether the thinking being be held the only real subject, which, in becoming conscious of itself, implies, and thus necessitates, the existence of that which is not itself; or whether Thought—absolute, impersonal Thought—be the only real being, which, in its efforts to realize itself, develops into consciousness in man, with all the phenomena of which thought in man is conscious; it equally results, that in the thinking being, the self, resides the true, the good, the beautiful, the law and measure of all truth, and goodness, and beauty. The truths, therefore, of religion and morality are intuitions, rather than revelations; or if revelations, revealed to the individual consciousness, rather than by external instruments through the outward senses. Authority, testimony, the evidence of history and facts, are of no weight in comparison with the dictates of the regnant self within. Doctrines, equally claiming a divine origin, must be discriminated by 'the verifying faculty; ' duties, though professing to be of divine obligation, must be accepted or rejected in accordance with the intuition of the individual conscience."

We know how these principles have wrought

themselves out in theology ; — in Essays which, professing to treat the Bible as any other book, yet judge of its credibility by subjective assumptions instead of by objective authority, doubting of miracles because miraculous, and rejecting prophecies because fulfilled ; in Commentaries which, based on the postulate that there is in every man an intuitive or divine light before which every question of morals or of faith is to be brought for judgment, not only question the authenticity or credibility of much of the Old Testament, but reject from the teaching of the New the doctrines of original guilt, of the atonement, of justification by faith, and of the indwelling of the Holy Spirit otherwise than as that Spirit teaches and dwells in all men : and in Biographies of our blessed Lord and Saviour, which, in place of the perfect portraiture of the Gospels, give us, as in an illumined mirror, the reflection of the writer's own conceptions,—not what the divine Redeemer was, but what in his ideal he ought to be.

But the same principles necessarily affect also the general tone of morality. In proportion as truth becomes that which each one troweth, will duty be that which each one listeth. That such a process has been going on amongst us is painfully witnessed by the lowering of the moral standard, widely, though far from universally, in the upper ranks of society, as testified by qualified and impartial witnesses ; by the character of the senti-

ments and incidents by which it is often sought to give interest to fiction; and especially by the poetry of the day,—the truest test of the moral atmosphere,—which, with very many healthy exceptions, tends to become unspiritual, earthly, sensuous, and is even dragged at times, without altogether forfeiting readers or admirers, into depths which recal the foulest strains of heathendom. In quite another sphere of thought and action it has perceptibly modified the idea and obligation of law,—not by reviving the wild doctrines of the sixteenth and eighteenth centuries that law is unnecessary or inconsistent with human liberty and need not be obeyed, but by erecting self into the judge of law, prompting the individual to decide what is, or ought to be, law, and measuring its obligation accordingly. Complaints are rife of the spirit of self-assertion and insubordination which exhibits itself in every rank and in most of the relations of life. It is not to be expected that we should be altogether exempt. There are very few men who are not affected, however, unconsciously, by the spirit of the age they live in. Even the most firmly rooted tree will show the direction of the wind by the motion of its boughs and leaves. Bishops may take their own will for the rule they decide by; and Clergy may invalidate external authority by a strong persuasion of the rectitude and rights of their own judgment. Indications are not wanting of such a tendency. Those who recollect the evidence given before the

Ritual Commission, will remember that at least one earnest and able man, when pressed with the question who was to decide what were or were not the "uses" of the Catholic Church which he felt bound in conscience to employ in preference to the "uses" of the Church of England, which is only a National Church, admitted that the decision must ultimately rest with himself.¹ The provision made for "appeasing all diversity and for the resolution of all doubts concerning the manner how to understand, do and execute the things contained in the book of Common Prayer," by requiring that "the parties that so doubt or diversely take any thing, shall alway resort to the Bishop of the diocese, who by his discretion shall take order for the quieting and appeasing of the same," has been reduced to a dead letter by the persistent denial of the parties, at least on one side, that they have any doubt whatever as to the point in question. The promise made by the Candidate in the Ordination Service that he will "reverently obey his Ordinary, . . . following with a glad mind and will his godly admonitions, and submitting himself to his godly judgements," and the oath taken by every one instituted or licensed to a cure of souls, that he "will pay true and Canonical obedience to his Bishop in all things lawful and honest," were interpreted commonly, in the memory of some of us, to bind us to obedience in all matters in themselves undetermined or indifferent, being neither

¹ Evidence before the Ritual Commission, 257.

contrary to law nor unbecoming a Clergyman and Christian. They are at present interpreted by men of the highest character and altogether incapable of an evasion, to oblige to obedience in such matters only as can be enforced by law. I am not now inquiring which is the true interpretation; although if it be the latter, it becomes a question whether the oath of Canonical obedience, being an unnecessary, and therefore bordering on a profane oath, ought still to be required. I am only illustrating and proving the position that the ideas of law and of obligation to obedience have undergone, even among ourselves, important modifications during the period of little more than a generation: and I have done so more at length, because the fact, if it be a fact, duly pondered and applied, will prove the key to other difficulties of our position, besides the one immediately before us, which is the enfeeblement of Episcopal authority, and the consequent inability of the Bishop to assist Parishioners to assert and maintain the rights which belong to them in the true ideal of the Parochial System.

It might be thought uncandid to leave unnoticed another theory, which is put forward with a claim to be "both widely held and held by persons of position, influence and character."¹ It is stated that the authority of the Bishops is, must be and ought to be impaired, because they one and all accept the present condition of the

¹ See the Preface to "The Four Cardinal Virtues," by the Rev. Orby Shipley, pp. xiii.—xv.

Church in its relations to the State, as, on the whole, justifiable ; because, as an Order, they have pronounced against the “Catholic revival,” as it is called, “from beginning to end ;” and because, consequently, “the Episcopal mind is out of harmony with the mind of the Presbyterate,” who have “been forced to choose between God and man ; and hence has been evoked what seems to be lawlessness, but in truth is obedience to a higher law than Acts of Parliament.” So far as such a statement is not due to exaggeration, what is it but saying that the Bishops, as a body, have been faithful to the constitution, doctrine and discipline of the Church of which they are members, and have consequently and naturally incurred the displeasure, the distrust and sometimes the disobedience of that portion of the Clergy and Laity—(a small portion compared with the great body of the Church, although large enough to tempt them to encourage themselves and confront others with the dangerous argument of success),—who have been led on, unhappily, step by step by various influences, some doctrinal, some æsthetic, some almost purely political, to disparage, first, and then to disavow the Reformation, to revive many of the tenets and most of the practices which our Church at that time deliberately laid aside, and to be discontented with the established constitution of Church and State, the discipline of which grates on their principles and the law of which restricts their practices. Painful as such

antagonism is, this is not a position which will tarnish the character or injure the influence of the Bishops of the Church of England. We are Bishops, indeed, of the Catholic Church : but we are so, because we are Bishops of that pure and Apostolic branch of it, the Reformed Church of England, which is Protestant as against the usurpations and corruptions of the Church of Rome, and Catholic as holding the whole deposit of the primitive faith and all the essentials of primitive discipline. We are able, therefore, to sympathise with that theological movement which for forty years has been leavening, rousing and dividing our Church, so far as it has brought forward into due prominence truths, which though always held, had been comparatively neglected ; so far as it has more fully realized the idea of the Church as a divine Institution gifted with spiritual endowments, and has abstracted it more distinctly from the accidents of establishment and temporal privileges ; so far as it has obtained a wider and deeper recognition of the necessity of the Sacraments as essential means of grace, and has revived a belief in the duty and blessings of worship as distinct from, though combined with, prayer ; so far as it has grappled successfully with the carelessness and indifference which had too much debased our public services, has drawn attention to rubrics, has taught order and reverence, has promoted daily prayer and frequent communions, and, in alliance with the æsthetic revival of the time, has powerfully

tended in our Church to adorn its fabrics, to improve its music, and to infuse into its various offices the attractive and quickening influence of the beauty of holiness. Nor are we debarred, thank God, from admitting and admiring the piety, zeal and self-denying energy of many whom the current of this movement is carrying, as we fear, beyond the true limits of the Church of England and even the circle of revealed truth. We can sympathise in their efforts to save souls. We can love them for their goodness' sake. But we may, we must, pray all the more fervently, that He in whose hands are the hearts of men, will, in His great mercy, dispel the delusions which are around them, and save them from a too probable fall into perilous error and irremediable schism.

We can do this. But when we find the "Catholic revival," so called, asserted as the antithesis and antidote to the Reformation, which is deplored as a misfortune if not a sin; when its work is admitted, and indeed avowed, to be to undo what was then done; when Holy Scripture is disparaged as the rule of Faith unless as supplemented and explained by "Catholic teaching," and the thirty-nine Articles are complained of as an unfair burden, put aside as obsolete, or interpreted in a sense which, if their words can be wrested into bearing, is undoubtedly not that which they were intended to bear; when the doctrines of those who drew them up, are disclaimed as uncatholic and almost condemned as heretical; when language is used, popu-

larly and without qualification, on the subject of the Holy Eucharist, which, whether capable or not of being absolved, under qualification, of contradiction to our formularies, is not only declared by Protestants but claimed by Romanists to be identical with Transubstantiation; when seven Sacraments are again taught, and Confession with absolution is enjoined, not as an occasional remedy for exceptional doubts and sorrows, but as the ordinary rule of a holy life, and the needful preparation for Holy Communion; when Prayers for the dead are recommended and Purgatory more than hinted at; when the *cultus* of the Virgin and the invocation of Saints are introduced into books of devotion, which are framed on the Romish model, and adapted to, and distributed among persons of all ages, ranks and occupations; when, finally, we are told, that in order to "stabilitate the conquests over Protestantism and to re-Catholicise the Church of England" it still remains "to make confession the ordinary custom of the masses, and to teach them to use Eucharistic worship, to establish the claim to Catholic Ritual in its highest form, to restore the Religious life" (meaning the life of the Cloister), "to say Mass daily, and to practise Reservation for the sick";¹ when this movement is thus developed in its results or explained by its supporters, it is not possible that it could be received by Bishops of the Reformed Church of England with anything

¹ "The Four Cardinal Virtues," p. 221.

but disapprobation, warning and sorrowful rebuke, unless they were unfaithful indeed to their Office, their vows, and their Master the Lord Jesus Christ. There are, as we have seen, causes at work which tend to limit practically and enfeeble the authority of the Episcopate: but fidelity to the distinctive principles, doctrines and discipline of the Church of England is not one of these. It is no source of weakness; it is a ground and necessary condition of strength.

However caused, in whatever ways deprived of their safeguards and remedies, the loss or diminution of the rights of the laity in their respective Parishes is a serious evil—an element of weakness to the Clergy and the Church. With the rights of the Parishioners must go much of their interest in the Parish and much of the sense of their responsibility. They are less disposed to work with their Pastor in his efforts for the spiritual and temporal good of his people and others; less ready to defend the Church and its interests against attacks from without. And the laity are feeling their exclusion and its evils. Witness the reception given in the House of Commons to two Bills for the establishment of Parochial Councils brought in, in successive years, by a noble Lord, himself an earnest Churchman, to whose prudence, energy and untiring exertion this diocese owes much. And witness a clause in the Private Chapels Bill of last session, which, though not free from objection, was inserted in one House and supported by a large minority in

the other, because it appeared to provide for one of those cases in which the autocracy of the Clergy and the helplessness of the laity have been most keenly felt. This is a subject, my Reverend Brethren, which will, I hope, receive your early and very careful consideration. It is one of no little difficulty. The problem is how to restore the rights of the laity without impeding the spiritual authority and the consequent responsibility of the Incumbent; to concede the claims of Parishioners without interfering with the due requirements of Churchmen; to maintain, amidst the numerous sects and opinions of the nineteenth Century, the distinctive character of the Church of England, without narrowing the area of a Parish to the congregation of an individual Pastor.

I am quite aware that in dwelling at so great length on the actual condition of the Parochial System in our own diocese, on the fact and causes of its failure, and on the various means by which we may hope to invigorate it, if it cannot be restored, I have been detaining you among the machinery, so to speak, of the momentous work entrusted to us; and that far more important than all schemes of organization, than the building of Churches and the adjustment of endowments, is the piety, the zeal and self-devotion of the Clergy, the faithfulness of their preaching, the consistency of their lives, the influence of their example. May God keep us all ever mindful of this great truth. But how solemn, how awful, is this Parochial System of which we

have been speaking, as spread out before us in this enormous diocese! The charge of an ever-growing population of above 2,650,000 souls committed, in the first instance, to the Bishop as Chief Pastor, and by him subdivided among the Incumbents of the various Parishes and Ecclesiastical districts, so that to each belongs the cure and government of the souls of a definite number of human beings dwelling within a prescribed area. It is not as if each were sent out as a Missionary into the mighty mass of this teeming city to deliver his message as, and to whom, he could; when his labour would be measured but by each day's strength, and his responsibilities by each day's failure or success. Every Parish Priest is the appointed Pastor of a distinct flock, for which he is responsible and for which alone, ordinarily, he is responsible: immortal souls, each of whom is the purchase of Christ's blood, each of whom must appear before Christ's judgment seat, each of whom needs the regenerating, converting, sanctifying grace of God's word and Sacraments, and most of whom at times require the Pastor's warning, counsel, comfort or prayers. It is true, indeed,—God be thanked for it!—that we do not serve a hard Master, and that He will be merciful to those who in the midst of overwhelming duties and numbers beyond their strength, have “done what they could:” but it is also true, that the Parish Priest is “never to cease his labour, his care and diligence,”—which he never therefore can cease in this life,—“until

he has done all that lieth in him, according to his bounden duty, to bring all such as are committed to his charge, unto that agreement in the faith and knowledge of God, and to that ripeness and perfectness of age in Christ, that there be no place left among them either for error in religion or for viciousness in life.”¹ This high standard of duty, —at least as a guide to our desires, prayers and efforts,—is set ever before *us* whose lot is cast and labour allotted in the midst of numbers beyond the reach of our time and strength ; of ignorance, vice and misery ; of moral and physical evils mutually reacting on and increasing each other ; of the systematized profligacy which is the curse of large cities,—the tempters and tempted, the betrayers and betrayed ;—of multiform error in belief and practice, of coarse infidelity, smiling sneering scepticism, polite unbelief scarcely concealed beneath a decent conformity, and the wide hard surface of indifference and worldly respectability, so smooth, so level, but on which the fruit of the Spirit cannot grow. “Who is sufficient for these things ?” There can hardly be in the whole vineyard of Christ’s Church a plot which requires so urgently as that which we have to till, earnest ceaseless endeavours, devoted holy lives, and the patient fervency of prayer, if we are to do anything in our day to supply the defects of the past and to meet the evils of the present, to apply the Gospel remedy to the sin-stricken multitudes

¹ Exhortation in Service for “ Ordering of Priests.”

around us, and to establish the Church of Christ on a broad and stable basis, so that all who will, of those millions to whom we minister, may find within her bounds the fresh springs for their souls' thirst, the means and aid and guidance to train them for eternity.

I am very far from implying that of these requirements there is in our diocese (excepting as regards our numbers) any special deficiency. On the contrary,—notwithstanding faults, failures, evils which we all deplore, notwithstanding the self-accusations which most of us are conscious of—those most so perhaps who are the least guilty,—there is, thank God ! amongst the Clergy of the Metropolis—and let me add amongst the laity who assist them,—a very large amount of faithful earnest self-denying labour, patiently and perseveringly bestowed often when there are few to encourage or observe; sometimes ill paid with barely a maintenance, and, as far as this world's prospects go, not even requited with hope. May God accept and reward it hereafter ! But while grateful for this, may I be pardoned a jealous fear lest what is gained by energy, should be imperilled or impaired by want of unity. Even in the partial isolation of his Parochial duties the Pastor is cheered and strengthened by the conviction that he is one of many, working the same work on every side of him with mutual sympathies and a brother's heart. And to meet attacks from without, either of error against the truth or of hostile principles against the Church, we have need

of serried ranks and shoulder joined to shoulder, each covering other with the shield of charity. In this respect the Clergy of the Metropolis have always, perhaps, been at some disadvantage compared with those of other dioceses. The engrossing occupations of a large parish, the many interests and pursuits which a city offers and the country wants, the abundance of lay society which to some extent it may be even a duty for each to cultivate, make Clerical intercourse more rare and Clerical intimacy less frequent; and though general liberality of sentiment may be expected, and will be found, in the midst of the intellectual activity and ceaseless play of opinion which goes on around us, there is less perhaps of that wholesome friction of personal association which rubs down the angles of real or supposed differences and brings together the broad surfaces of substantial agreement. This is, however, a defect which is capable of remedy, and has been partially remedied, by Ruridecanal Chapters, and by more frequent meetings of Clergy for consultations and discussions such as are held at Sion College and elsewhere. I am referring now to elements of disunion arising from recent events, which, whether reasonably or not, are as a matter of fact, relaxing the bonds of brotherhood, and rendering much more difficult and much less hopeful any common effort against the common foe,—the infidelity, ungodliness and worldliness with which we have to contend.

And here I must leave out of consideration the

extreme differences on either side : those on the one hand who dislike and disavow the Reformation, teach many of the doctrines and revive many of the practices which our Church then renounced, and look forward to a corporate union with unreformed Rome ; and those, on the other, in whose teaching the truth of the atonement has shrunk into an example and motive, the doctrine of the true divinity of the Saviour seems to be in abeyance, and the special grace of the Holy Ghost which sanctifies the elect, is resolved into an universal effluence of mental or moral gifts bestowed in various degrees on all. The existence of such errors within the Church does indeed impair its unity and impede united action : nor is it easy for loyal members of the Church of England to co-operate cordially with those who hold them, even while they admire their piety and emulate their zeal. Such errors must be left for their removal, in God's good time, not, in my opinion, to judicial proceedings, which, however justifiable and sometimes perhaps necessary as the layman's protection against false teaching in his Parish Church, can never stay the course of error, though they may raise a prejudice in its favour ; still less to invective, misrepresentation, or the bitterness of controversy ; but to fair and considerate argument ever distinguishing the man from the doctrine, to careful patient inculcation of the truth, and to earnest prayer to the God and Giver of truth, who ofttimes in the Church's history, without any adequate

human agency, has by His Spirit—as by the viewless wind,—swept away the clouds of error which hung darkly over it, and restored the troubled surface to light and peace.

But apart from these extremes, we must all be conscious of a slackening of the ties between those who, with whatever minor differences, are in essentials one, occasioned by the progress of late events and specially by the result of recent trials. There is in the minds of many a feeling of disappointment, perhaps of indignation, a sense of having been wronged, almost of having been persecuted, and a sentiment of discontent with those whom the decisions have satisfied, with the Court which advised them, and with the constitution of the Church in relation to the State which has rendered them possible. There is nothing surprising in this. It is natural; almost inevitable. Had the judgments been the reverse of what they are, the same effects would have followed, though the parties affected would have been different. And as such feelings are mitigated by time, it may confidently be hoped that a calmer and juster view may be taken of the circumstances which have excited them.

The course of events which has led to this issue is easy to trace, though in some of its features unfortunate. The progress of the movement we have before alluded to, which though mainly theological is partly æsthetic, had under both influences carried on some to the belief that the so-called Ornament Rubric justified, at least, if it

did not oblige,—notwithstanding the disuse of three centuries,—the introduction of the Vestments and other ornaments of the Church and its Ministers,—which were prescribed in the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. They added, it was thought, solemnity and beauty to the service: they symbolized, it was said, certain important doctrines. Under similar influences, a novel, even though it had proved a correct, interpretation was put upon other Rubrics, such as that concerning the bread to be used in Holy Communion and the position of the Minister while celebrating it. A few other practices long laid aside were re-introduced on the plea that, though not enjoined in post-Reformation prayer-books, they were not forbidden. These alterations, as was natural, aroused much feeling. Many were offended at their novelty; many others were alarmed at the doctrinal significance attributed to them. “Ritualism,” as it came to be called, became a party. Both sides appealed to the law. On the one hand the Bishops were loudly called upon to put down the illegal innovations: on the other they were warned not to interfere with those who alone were loyally acting up to the law of the Prayer-book. The questions raised were not without their difficulty. The leading lawyers of the land gave diverse opinions, not indeed on the whole question duly argued out, but on the cases submitted to them by either side. Many thought then,—I must venture to think so still,—that at that time, when all were appealing to the authority

of the law, while few comparatively had committed themselves to the altered usages, and men's feelings were less engaged than afterwards, it would have been wise to raise a suit, if it could not be altogether friendly, at least as free as possible from all personal bearings, and including all the disputed points, to be carefully argued out on both sides through all its stages, and finally decided only after the fullest discussion. But a Royal Commission had just dealt successfully with the difficult question of Clerical Subscription; and it was not unnaturally hoped, that the same machinery might also untie to the satisfaction of all parties the knots of the Ritual difficulty. This hope has not been fulfilled. The Church owes much, I believe, to the Ritual Commission,—more than she has yet realized. The new Table of Lessons which comes legally into use, as you are aware, with the beginning of next year, and will, I hope, be universally accepted in this diocese, will give the variety to repeated services, which here especially we need; will make more practicable, because less lengthy, the observance of daily prayer; and will help to extend the knowledge of Holy Scripture by bringing all the parts of it more generally and certainly before all classes. Other recommendations, which are now under the consideration of the Convocation of Canterbury, are intended to give freedom and elasticity to our services, to supply some deficiencies in them, and to adapt them more accurately to the wants of our day.

But the special object for which it was issued the Commission has not accomplished. Composed, in order to secure impartiality and confidence, of men of every variety of opinion in the Church, it is not surprising if it could not come to an agreement on the points on which the parties in the Church are, for the time being, most divided. It did indeed in its first Report express an opinion that certain excesses in Ritual should be restrained; and in a second Report, it suggested a process for restraining them without cost or delay: but these recommendations have led to no results. But the difficulties in the Prayer-book itself it has left almost as it found them. The Ornament Rubric is neither altered nor explained; the directions in the celebration of the Holy Communion, if ambiguous, are left ambiguous still. Meanwhile the novel or revived ritual practices became more widely accepted. Their legality was loudly asserted. That their opponents or the Bishops had not appealed to law was assumed to be a confession that the law was in their favour; and certain expressions in judgments on other points were rashly taken to be decisions on points which had not even been raised. Many who had no sympathy whatever with the doctrines of the School of the “Catholic Revival” adopted some of their practices in the belief that they were legal and right. At length the crisis came. After trials and decisions on one or two minor points, a suit was raised which included almost every question in dispute; an

undefended suit, unhappily, which therefore threw unfairly on the Judges the task of ascertaining for themselves all that could have been pleaded on the undefended side, and gave some colour to the dissatisfaction of those whom the result displeased. The decisions, however, either of the Dean of the Arches or of the Final Court of Appeal, have pronounced illegal almost all the revived Ritual, whether drawn from the first Prayer-book of Edward VI. or from pre-Reformation usage; have declared, in brief, that the practice of the Church of England for three hundred years has rightly interpreted her own mind and rubrics.

It is impossible that a decision could be given on such subjects at such a time without painful results. Whichever way the verdict fell, the smitten party must naturally feel disappointed, dissatisfied and wronged; a feeling which time and candid consideration alone can dispel or mitigate. Meanwhile questions are raised which interest far beyond the bounds of the party itself, —old questions always underlying the complex relations of the Church with civil society, which circumstances ever and anon call into renewed activity. So in the present case, many who have never used the ritual which has been declared unlawful and have little sympathy with the principles with which it has become connected, are yet disturbed by the process which has led to the result. The State, it is said, usurps an office which does not belong to it and infringes on the inalien-

able rights of the Church when it decides questions of doctrine and discipline ; and especially when it decides them by a lay Court before which such questions have been improperly and accidentally brought. Such decisions, whether right or wrong, have an inherent flaw and can deserve little respect.

In such statements there will be found, I venture to think, much confusion of thought.

The Church of England in its relation to the State is based on two co-ordinate but not antagonistic principles. On the one hand, “The Church hath power to decree Rites or Ceremonies and authority in controversies of faith :”¹ and this power is limited only by the compass and authority of “God’s word written.” On the other hand the Crown is supreme, in this Realm, over all persons and in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil : and this power can be exercised in matters ecclesiastical only when some “cause” arises ; *i.e.* when the civil power is appealed to to protect some right or to remedy some wrong. At the Reformation the Church, under the necessities of the times, exerted her authority in Controversies of Faith, partly in the revision of the Prayer-book so far as such revision was doctrinal, but principally by the publication of the “Articles agreed upon by the Archbishops and Bishops of both Provinces and the whole Clergy in the Convocation holden at London in 1562,” and again confirmed by the subscription of the Convocation in 1571. These

¹ Article XX.

Articles, in which the sufficiency of Holy Scripture as the Rule of Faith was asserted, the authority of the three Creeds affirmed, all the great Catholic doctrines of our faith defined, and mediæval errors and innovations condemned, have remained thenceforth without alteration or addition. They, with the Prayer-book, are still the Church's test of doctrine to which the teaching of her Ministers is to be conformed, and by which its soundness or unsoundness are to be tested. But though the Church has not again exercised her authority in controversies of Faith, she has not lost it. If occasion requires, it is quite competent to her to use it still. If, for instance, it should be held, after the decision in the cases of the Bishop of Salisbury *v.* Williams and of Fendall *v.* Wilson, that our Church in the sixteenth century, having then no experience or fear of errors on those subjects, had not defined sufficiently the doctrine of the Inspiration of Holy Scripture, or had removed incautiously the safeguard against the tenet that all men shall at length be saved, it is in the power of the Church now,—whatever may be thought of the expediency of using it,—in her Convocations or Synods to enact additional Articles on these points, although, for reasons which will appear directly, she could not enforce them under penalties without the sanction of the State.

At the Reformation, too, our Church exercised her power to decree rites and ceremonies by the several revisions of the Prayer-book: and in so

doing she not only laid aside those which were deemed “contrary to God’s word written” or had their origin in superstition, but acting on the indefeasible right (according to Hooker’s unanswered argument) of every independent Church in the unity of the Church Catholic, she omitted or varied others which, however innocent and even primitive, by change of time or circumstances, had lost their suitableness or their meaning. That the mixture of water with the Eucharistic wine, for instance, though a primitive and innocent custom, was thus discontinued, we have the authority of Dean Field, the cotemporary of Hooker and himself no Puritan, who gives with the fact what may be termed the common-sense reason, when he writes: “They (*i.e.* Tertullian and the ancients) mingled water with that wine which they consecrated in the blessed Sacrament, because even in ordinary use their wines being hot were wont to be so allayed: we not having the like reason of mixture, mingle not water with wine in the Sacrament, as likewise the Armenians do not.”¹ Further acts of the exercise of this power took place in 1603-4, when the Canons were enacted by Convocation, in 1662 when the Prayer-book was revised, and last year when the new Table of Lessons was accepted. It will be another such act, if our Convocations should, as I hope, adopt at least many of the recommendations of the fourth Report of the Ritual Commission. In the Articles, Prayer book and Canons

¹ Field “Of the Church,” Appendix, pt. iii. (vol. iv. 554).

therefore the Church of England has used her power to decree Rites and Ceremonies, and her authority in controversies of faith. These are her laws to which we are bound to submit, and which her Ordinaries are to administer.

If the Church were not merely not established, but entirely without endowment, then, and only then, would she be wholly exempt from all civil interference and control. She could not indeed enforce her own laws on the unwilling, excepting by the purely spiritual force of excommunication freed from all temporal consequences. But the moment an endowment however small, a right however trifling, is created, a wrong becomes possible, and consequently an appeal to the civil Court to redress it. The Minister of the smallest sect, if he has a *right* to a few pounds a year or to the use of a certain room or pulpit on the condition that he teaches the doctrines of that sect, may, if an attempt is made to deprive him of it, seek the protection of the law; and the Courts may have to determine by the comparison of his teaching with the doctrinal standards of the sect, whether or not they are in accord, and whether he has forfeited his rights or not. Only pure voluntaryism on the one hand, or entire absence of dogmatic symbols or disciplinary rules on the other, can free a Church or any religious body from judgments of the civil Courts as to what *are* its discipline and doctrine. Establishment does not create this liability, nor would disestablishment annul it. A National

Church, indeed, touches the State at many more points: their rights and duties are interlaced; and many more wrongs are therefore possible, which may require to be redressed. In the Parochial System, for example,—the form into which a National Church is naturally cast and on which we have to-day been dwelling,—the Minister, on the one hand, has a right to his endowment, his House, his Church, and his privilege of teaching and ministering therein: his Parishioners, on the other hand, have their rights to have the doctrines of the Church of England and none other preached to them, to have divine worship conducted and the Sacraments administered in accordance with its laws, and to be protected from a Clergyman who should discredit his teaching and scandalize his people by vice and immorality. The State, too, in order to the maintenance of these wide-spreading and, in theory, general rights, has given coercive vigour to the Church's ordinances of doctrine and discipline by statutory enactments, not thereby decreeing rites or ceremonies or exercising authority in controversies of Faith, but adopting the Church's laws into its own statute book, and thus enabling rights arising from them to be maintained or wrongs connected with them to be remedied, not merely by spiritual censures, but by civil consequences. For the same purpose it also arms the spiritual Courts with these statutory powers, thus making the Church's Courts the Courts also of the Crown.

The position therefore of an established Church, and that of a Church or other religious body not established but not without endowment, are, as regards the power of the interference of the State with their doctrines and rites, in principle, the same. Both may define their own doctrines, and ordain their own ceremonies. A member of either body, believing himself injured with respect to any right which endowment has created, may appeal to his country's Courts, the one to the temporal Courts, the other to the spiritual Courts armed by the State with coercive power. In either case the Courts must take the dogmatic formularies, canons, or other rules of the religious community, as the rule of their judgment, must discuss their true meaning and application, and decide accordingly. In either case there is an immediate appeal from these Courts to the Crown, as being in all causes ecclesiastical as well as civil supreme. And in either case the question before the Court, whether in the first instance or on appeal, is in its nature the same. It is not whether the doctrines contained in the dogmatic formularies of the religious body are true or false, scriptural or heretical, but only whether, being such as they are, the teaching of one of the parties to the suit has been so different from what appears to be their true meaning as to forfeit his rights or to convict him of a wrong, under the laws of the community to which he belongs. It is not whether such a rite or ceremony is edifying or superstitious,

whether it symbolizes an important doctrine or implies a serious error; but whether it is or is not ordered or permitted by the rubric, canon, or other authoritative direction of the religious body; and whether, therefore, the party to the suit has, by using or omitting it, broken its laws and wronged those to whom he ministers. This principle has always been distinctly laid down in our law Courts. "This Court," are the words of the judgment of the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council in the case of *Gorham v. Bishop of Exeter*, "has no jurisdiction or authority to settle matters of faith, or to determine what ought, in any particular, to be the doctrine of the Church of England. Its duty extends only to the consideration *of that which is by law established* to be the doctrine of the Church of England upon the true and legal construction of her Articles and Formularies." "The question we have to decide is not whether the opinions under our consideration are theologically sound or unsound . . . but whether they are contrary or repugnant to the doctrines which the Church of England, by its Articles, Formularies, and Rubrics, requires to be held by its Ministers, so that, upon the ground of those opinions, the appellant can be lawfully excluded from the Benefice to which he has been presented."

The State, therefore,—or more accurately the Court which administers the Church's laws with coercive jurisdiction granted by the State,—does not, in any manner which would be an usurpation of

the Church's proper province; decide questions of doctrine and discipline. All questions of doctrine and discipline which, it was contemplated, could arise, the Church has decided already: and her decisions are digested into her Articles and Prayer-book, her Rubrics and Canons, as the laws to which her members are to conform. The Courts do but decide whether, such being her doctrines and discipline, this one or that of her Members has, as it is alleged, forfeited his rights or committed a wrong, by teaching at variance with those doctrines or by actions in contravention of that discipline.

It is no doubt true, that such decisions may occasionally dismiss a teacher of unsound doctrine with impunity, or may punish for a breach of discipline which at the present time may be thought unimportant; and may thus appear on the one hand to sanction error, or on the other to be hard and unfair. It will be so, if the formularies which constitute the law of doctrine are ambiguous or deficient in precision, (in which case the accused is entitled to the benefit of the doubt), or if the error is one for which, being unforeseen, no corrective has been provided; and it will be so, if rubrics or canons adapted to one state of circumstances are left in force unmodified, when circumstances have changed. But this consequence is not peculiar to our Courts, as at present established: it belongs to all Courts which in such cases administer justice justly. No Court, ecclesiastical or temporal, whether the judges are lay or spiritual, has the right

to alter or amend the law by which it acquits or condemns. Such alteration belongs to the Legislature, be it of Church or of State, and has its force in the future, not in the past or the present. And if any Court, either out of regard to truth or from fear of consequences, were to condemn a Minister for teaching the contrary,—not to what the Church's authorized formularies say, but to what they *ought* to say,—it would mistake its functions and would do a wrong. The best theology might be the greatest injustice.

And this consideration may lead us to pause before we agree with those who hold it a grievance that Ecclesiastical causes should be tried in Lay Courts, meaning, I presume, Courts in which laymen are judges. In the technical sense such causes never do come into Lay Courts. The Diocesan Court is Ecclesiastical; the Provincial Court is Ecclesiastical; and the Final Court of Appeal, being the Crown itself as supreme over all Ecclesiastical causes, is, while deciding such causes, Ecclesiastical. I am not bound nor disposed to defend the constitution and modes of procedure of our Ecclesiastical Courts, or of the Final Court of Appeal. They are liable to serious objections, and are capable perhaps of much improvement; and those persons who feel aggrieved by their decisions, cannot turn their injured feelings to more legitimate account, than by making them a motive to examine the difficulties of a very difficult question, and to suggest amend-

ments, which, if they approve themselves to the public mind, it would not perhaps be difficult to carry out. But in all such inquiries it should be borne in mind, that if it is the duty of a Court of Justice, as distinguished from a legislative body Spiritual or Temporal, not to make laws, but to administer them, and to decide by *what is*, not by *what ought to be*, then will that Court be the best, in which this rule of procedure is most effectually secured. Now we need not be ashamed to confess, my Reverend Brethren,—for it is not to our discredit,—that it is on many accounts more difficult for us than for legally trained laymen, to form an unbiassed judgment in causes of doctrine or discipline. I do not say that we are not better qualified to decide what *ought* to be the opinion of the Church on the points at issue, what in other words is the teaching of Scripture or the most correct inference from it, what is most in accordance with the Faith once delivered to the Saints. But this question is not and cannot be before the Court, which has only to consider whether such teaching, or such a practice, is or is not at variance with the Church's formularies as they are. For such bare abstract comparison of the true grammatical meaning of words and phrases we, on such a subject, hardly are,—perhaps hardly ought to be,—impartial judges. Zeal for God's truth, dread of the danger and infection of false doctrine, jealousy for the strict orthodoxy and sufficiency of our own formularies, all may tend to give an unfelt bias

to our judgment, may shift imperceptibly the rightful issue, and may make us for the truth's sake unconsciously unfair. Even then, if in the trial of Ecclesiastical causes it is thought desirable to have the help of Ecclesiastics as better acquainted with the accurate and technical meaning of theological terms, with the history and development of religious dogmas and their definitions as affected thereby, it is surely important for the sake of the party accused, and for the appearance at least, if not for the security of impartiality, that there should be among the Judges trained legal minds, accustomed to examine questions in the abstract, freer at least than ourselves from the disturbing influence of strong theological convictions, and far less liable to confuse unconsciously what law is with what law ought to be. And there are few of us perhaps who, if accused unjustly (as we should of course believe) of teaching doctrine inconsistent with that of our Church, especially in times of religious excitement, would not prefer to have our trial before a Court of which lay lawyers formed a part than before the purely ecclesiastical tribunal of a Convocation or a Synod.

It deserves also to be borne in mind, that in all such ecclesiastical cases the rights of the laity, as well as those of the Clergy, are at issue; that their main object, indeed, is not the punishment of the Clergyman, but the protection of the Parishioners from false doctrine, from defect or illegality of ritual, or from the scandal of an evil life: and that

a lay or mixed Court, therefore, and not a Synod, is what the laity may not unjustly claim.

This advantage, at least, is possessed by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, which now advises the Crown in the final appeal in all causes Ecclesiastical, that it has the assistance of the ablest and most experienced Judges of the land. But it is objected that Ecclesiastical causes have come before this tribunal unintentionally and as it were accidentally: that its original purpose was to hear appeals in Admiralty and Colonial cases; that it does not speak to us in the name of the Church of England, nor has its jurisdiction ever been formally recognized by the collective Church.

The principle that the Crown is supreme in all causes and over all persons Ecclesiastical *has been* formally recognized by the Church. Whether in the exercise of this supremacy appeals to the Crown shall be heard in Chancery or in Council, whether the Crown shall be advised by the Court of Delegates or by the Judicial Committee of Privy Council, has never, indeed, been decided by Synod or Convocation. It can hardly be claimed that the constitution of Courts of Justice, either Ecclesiastical or Civil, should be submitted to these bodies for their acceptance. But short of this, it is difficult to imagine any tribunal which owes its origin more to Ecclesiastical persons, or was occasioned more by Ecclesiastical considerations, than the Judicial Committee of Privy Council. It was a Royal Commission appointed in 1830 to inquire

into the Proceedings and Suits and other matters instituted and carried on in *the Ecclesiastical Courts* of England and Wales, on which sat Archbishop Howley, Bishops Blomfield and Kaye, Sir John Nicholl, Sir Herbert Jenner and Dr. Lushington, which, as its first act at the beginning of the next year, reported that it would be expedient to abolish the jurisdiction hitherto exercised by Judges Delegate and to transfer the right of hearing appeals to the Privy Council. An Act passed in the next year enacted the transfer;¹ and another Act in the subsequent year, which the Archbishop of Canterbury supported, and which was assented to by the other Episcopal Members of the Commission, supplied the machinery by which the Privy Council was to hear the appeals already transferred to it, as well as others now first brought before it, by the establishment of the Judicial Committee.² It is true that in this Act no distinct mention is made of Ecclesiastical causes, which however were necessarily included among the appeals transferred, nor are the Episcopal members of the Privy Council placed on the Committee. The reason for this omission may be easily inferred. The Final Court of Appeal formed but a small and almost incidental portion of the matters dealt with by the Royal Commission of 1830. It presented in 1832 an elaborate Report, in which, besides repeating the recommendation that the appeal in Ecclesiastical

¹ 2 and 3 Will. IV. c. 92.

² 3 and 4 Will. IV. c. 41.

tical causes should be transferred to the Privy Council, it dealt at length with the subjects of the Ecclesiastical Courts, of Pluralities, Non-residence and the correction of criminous Clerks; and it was the declared intention of the Prelates who sat on the Commission, to embody its recommendations as soon and as far as possible, in Acts of Parliament. The first legislative result of the Commission was the statute 1 and 2 Vic. c. 106, usually known as the Plurality Act; but this being administrative, and not touching on the action of the Ecclesiastical Courts, could contain no reference to the Final Court of Appeal. The constitution, indeed, of the Ecclesiastical Courts themselves was never dealt with, owing to inherent difficulties which have not yet been overcome; but two years afterwards, in 1840, was passed the Clergy Discipline Act,¹ which prescribes the manner of trying and correcting Clerks accused of offences against the laws Ecclesiastical, including, of course, charges of false doctrine as well as of breaches of discipline or of immorality; and in this Act, being the first and only Act in which occasion was given, it is provided that for the purpose of hearing appeals from the Ecclesiastical Courts every Archbishop or Bishop who is sworn of the Privy Council, shall be a member of the Judicial Committee. Whatever then may be thought of the competency of the Judicial Committee to decide Ecclesiastical

¹ 3 and 4 Vic. c. 86.

Appeals, it is an error to suppose that they come before it unintentionally and accidentally. The recommendation of the Commission in 1831 and 1832 was carried out in the Act of 1840. The framers of the Act had been members of the Commission, and they had been labouring at the subject during the whole interval. The words of Lord Brougham, indeed, and of Bishop Blomfield in the debate on the Bill brought in by the latter, on June 3d, 1850, have been quoted frequently, but not always quite accurately, in support of the opposite opinion. Lord Brougham is reported to have said that “he could not help feeling that the Judicial Committee of the Privy Council had been framed without the expectation”—(not of “ecclesiastical questions,” as is often stated, but)—“of questions like this which had produced the present measure,” *i.e.* the Gorham case, “being brought before it:” and it may rightly be inferred that his Lordship, who was not a Member of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission from which the recommendation emanated, but who, as Chancellor, would carry it out with a view mainly to such appeals as he was himself most conversant with, naturally enough did not anticipate the case of questions of doctrine being submitted to it. Bishop Blomfield’s words are thus reported: “The necessity of *some* change in this department of our Ecclesiastical Jurisprudence”—*i.e.* the final Court of Appeal in cases of false doctrine,—“was felt long before the recent appeal, at a time when the probability of

such an appeal was not in contemplation. It is only surprising that it was not clearly perceived at the time when the Judicial Committee was substituted for the old Court of Delegates. But no such necessity was then alluded to. The reason of which, I suppose, was this : that the appeals to that Court in suits involving questions of doctrine had been so exceedingly rare—not more than three or four from the first institution of that Court”—the Court of Delegates—“ that the contingency of such an appeal came into no one’s mind ; and as to all other kinds of appeal in ecclesiastical suits the Judicial Committee appears to be an unobjectionable tribunal, with one exception only, that its members are not necessarily, as they ought to be, members of the Church of England.”¹ Bishop Blomfield, then, held the Court of Delegates and the Judicial Committee to be alike unsatisfactory final Courts of Appeal in cases of false doctrine ; he was surprised that their unsuitableness was not perceived when the latter was, on the recommendation of the Ecclesiastical Courts Commission, substituted for the former ; and he accounted for it for his own part, and, speaking generally for others, (as for instance for Bishop Kaye, who made a similar statement in his Charge in 1852), by the supposition that the case of appeals on questions of doctrine had not occurred to them, probably on account of their previous infrequency. While, however, it is admitted, that the contingency of such cases did not occur to those very able Prelates,

¹ *Hansard*, vol. cxi. (June 3, 1850).

it is difficult to conceive that it could be altogether absent from the minds of such practised ecclesiastical lawyers as Sir J. Nicholl, Sir Herbert Jenner and Dr. Lushington, who yet did not feel the necessity of excepting such cases from the Court, the establishment of which they were recommending.

The late decisions which have occasioned so much excitement, were not on doctrine but on ritual, which probably Bishop Blomfield himself would not have been anxious to exclude from the jurisdiction of the Judicial Committee. It is urged indeed that Ritual may, and often does, imply doctrine; and that doctrine may be attacked through the side of Ritual. And this must be admitted: but it must also, I think, be admitted, that those who attach arbitrarily a doctrinal significance to an unauthorized Ritual Act, have no right to throw over that Act the sacred shield of doctrine. This, however, would seem to have been done by some whose opinions and feelings deserve every respect, in regard to the vexed question of the position of the Minister while reading the prayer of Consecration. Whatever may be thought of the judicial interpretation of the Rubric on which the question now turns, and which it would not become me to discuss here, the history of the question itself in the Reformed Church of England is sufficiently clear. That till the first quarter, at least, of the seventeenth century had passed, the position of the Minister must have been at the north side or end of the Holy Table, is demonstrated by the warm

controversy which raged respecting the position of the Table itself. On any other hypothesis the arguments employed on either side would be nugatory and unintelligible. But when this controversy subsided, and the Communion Table, under the influence of Archbishop Laud, generally stood, as now, against the east wall of the Church, even during the celebration of the Sacrament, then for the first time appeared instances of the eastward position of the Minister while consecrating the elements. Laud enjoined it in the Rubric of the Scottish Liturgy; Bishop Wren practised it; Cosin was accused of it. It was an innovation, and all three were called to account. The two former solemnly disclaimed any reason for the change but mere convenience: the last denied "that he did ever officiate with his face purposely towards the east," though as the elements were "usually placed in the middle of the table, which is about seven feet in length, which otherwise he could not conveniently reach," he might haply have consecrated eastward.¹ The rising controversy was swept away

¹ "Yet they say 'this very remove of the Presbyter during the time of Consecration upon trial imports much.' The Rubric professes that nothing is meant but that he may use both his hands with more ease and decency about that work. And I protest in the presence of Almighty God that I know of no other intention herein than this."—LAUD, *History of Troubles*. (Works, vol. iii. p. 346.) Bishop Wren's disclaimer is quoted in the judgment on Hibbert *v.* Purchas: that of Cosin will be found in the appendix to the "Acts of the High Commission Court of Durham, 1628-39," published by the Surtees Society, p. 218.

together with the Church and Monarchy: but at the Restoration and the Revision of the Prayer-book it is not an improbable theory which sees in the Rubric then added, a result of Cosin's own experience; a provision introduced by one of the ablest and most influential of the Revisers, to remedy the difficulty himself had felt, and to reconcile the recognized Anglican position of the Consecrating Priest at the north end of the Table with liberty to change his place in order so to arrange the elements as to bring them conveniently within his reach. However this may be, there is no doubt that onwards from the date of the Revision, and initiated apparently by the Revising Bishops and Clergy themselves, the practice of consecrating at the north end of the Table was the generally unbroken custom of the Church of England for 180 years; and even if it can be shown that during that period a few Clergymen here and there may have interpreted a not clearly-worded Rubric for themselves, the more important fact remains, that from the Reformation till a recent date no doctrinal significance appears to have been attached to the eastward position of the Minister, even by those who held strongly the tenets now supposed to be symbolized. If, therefore, the decision as to the true meaning of the Rubric touching the position of the Minister is now thought to reflect upon any doctrine, this result must in fairness be attributed to those who have connected that doctrine with their own interpretation of the Rubric,

without authority from the Church or from the framers of the Rubric themselves.

On another objection to the decisions of the Judicial Committee that (as contradistinguished, I presume, from those of other Courts) they are governed by personal bias and political considerations, I must decline to dwell. I would only beg of those who have hastily adopted it, to ask themselves, whether—strong though their own convictions might be, or plain their perceptions of consequences,—they would on *any account whatever* allow such motives to obscure their duty or the obligation of their oath, or to divert their judgment from the simple issue before them,—what is the actual law on such or such a point, and is the case a breach of it or not? And the measure they mete to themselves let them extend also to others.

But I hold it right to allude to a cognate complaint of partiality, alleged, not against the interpretation of law, but against the administration of it. Why, it is asked, is compliance required with some rubrics, while others are violated or neglected with impunity? The brief answer is, that in the one case a wrong is felt and complained of, in the other it is not. All rubrics in themselves are in law equally binding; all unauthorized additions to the service are equally illegal. But some rubrics are obsolete, having been found unsuited to the times or inconvenient in practice; and some additions have been consecrated by long usage. Who would

now wish to compel “ the Curates of every Parish often to admonish the people that they defer not the baptism of their children longer than the first or second Sunday next after their birth ? ”¹ or who would care to prohibit the doxology before the Gospel, or to forbid the use of metrical Psalms and Hymns ? Other omissions or practices, unlawful in themselves, are tolerated,—sometimes unhappily, —and even encouraged by the people. Here then is no wrong felt and no complaint made ; and the Ordinary’s exercise of authority is not called into action. It is true that the Bishop may direct proceedings *mero motu* ; but this power, which, if Churchwardens accurately and fearlessly did their duty, and provision were made for the expenses of prosecutions, would be almost unnecessary, he will usually reserve, if he is wise, for scandalous offences against morality or gross cases of erroneous teaching. But Parishioners have their rights, and may call upon the Bishop to maintain them in them : and although he has a certain discretion as to putting the law in motion,—to be exercised, I presume, when the accusation appears vexatious only, or when the complainant has no *locus standi* and no rights, or when the charge, though consistent with the letter of the law, is at variance with its spirit ; and although it forms no part of his duty to encourage suits ; yet he cannot, in my opinion, without injustice refuse to entertain the reasonable complaint of Parishioners who declare themselves

¹ Rubric before the Office of the Ministration of Private Baptism.

aggrieved by the illegal conduct of their Parish Priest. The unequal enforcement of the law is governed, then, not by the will or caprice of the Bishop, but by the requirements of the Parishioners: and knowing as we do, the ordinary dislike to the change of old customs, and that an alteration in order to comply with law will often give more offence than a customary illegality, we cannot be surprised if complaints are most rife, when acts which are innovations have also been declared to be unlawful.

I do not say that this is a satisfactory state of things. It is quite the reverse. It perpetuates division, gives its banners to party, irritates ill feeling where there should be only charity, and hinders united action, when it never was needed more, against ignorance, vice, and ungodliness. And I earnestly hope that when the recommendations of the Ritual Commission, or many of them at least, having been accepted by Convocation and legalized by Parliament, shall have cancelled obsolete and inexpedient rubrics, amended others, and supplied such as are wanting, we shall all of us, laying aside all party associations and personal preferences, loyally adopt and act upon the declared law of our Church, and thus at last abolish one powerful, but most unworthy cause, of keeping those who ought to be at one, asunder.

Meanwhile let me ask the co-operation of those (not very many perhaps now, but still too many) who, sensitive often to excess of Ritual in others,

either from jealousy of it or from carelessness allow themselves to neglect Rubrics which have their use and obligation still. Neither uniformity nor unity will ever be attained by lawsuits. Moral influence is that alone which can be both extensive and lasting. And a Bishop's moral influence in moderating excess of Ritual is seriously impaired, so long as those whom he addresses can point to others of their Brethren who are habitually ignoring Rubrics neither obsolete nor unimportant. May not a Clergyman, for example, when rebuked for the introduction of some unauthorized ceremony, feel some natural indignation when he observes his neighbour continually violating the Rubric which provides that “when there is a Communion, the Priest shall *then* (i.e. after presenting the Alms and before saying the prayer for the Church Militant) place upon the Table so much Bread and Wine as he shall think sufficient”? This Rubric is perfectly plain and undoubtedly binding. If it had at one time fallen considerably into desuetude, its vigour has been revived in a decision of the Final Court of Appeal.¹ It is practically without difficulty under almost any conceivable circumstances. It has about it no taint of superstition. Rather, while it is the intentional revival of

¹ Liddell *v.* Westerton. “In practice they—*i.e.* the Bread and Wine—are usually placed on the Communion Table before the commencement of the service, but certainly this is not according to the order prescribed.” Since this judgment in 1857, the Rubric has been much more generally observed.

one of the most beautiful customs of the earliest Liturgies, in which together with alms from our worldly goods, oblations of the fruits of the earth are presented thankfully to Him who gave them both,—τὰ σὰ ἐκ τῶν σῶν—it is also the protest of primitive times against the innovation of later days in which the consecrated Bread and Wine, transubstantiated in consecration into the substance of the Body and Blood of Christ, are offered as a propitiatory Sacrifice for the quick and the dead.

The directions concerning daily Prayer stand on somewhat different ground. “The Curate that ministereth in every Parish Church or Chapel being at home and not being otherwise reasonably hindered shall say the same in the Parish Church or Chapel where he ministereth.” It is probable that this Rubric could not be enforced. A “reasonable hindrance” is a vague condition incapable of being strictly defined: nor is it clear whether the Ordinary or the Clergyman’s conscience is to be the judge. But while it is admitted that the omission of the daily services is contemplated as possible and, under certain circumstances, excusable, it is evidently the intention of our Church that the performance of them should be the rule. The Parishioners of any Parish therefore, have, if they please, a right to them, which if it cannot be enforced at law, has at least a strong stress of moral obligation. Nor do I believe that any Incumbent who provides for his people those privileges which the Church thus promises them,

will fail to reap the fruit. Besides the refreshment of his own soul in the daily worship of the Sanctuary, he will gather around him usually in that little flock which meets him there, those who are his most devoted fellow-labourers in his works of charity, those who leaven most effectually the character of his congregation and parish, those whose consistent life and growth in grace cheer him most gratefully amidst the cares and disappointments of a Pastor's toil. It is true that at present the length of our daily services prevents many from attending them who would otherwise be worshippers: but this obstacle will be diminished by the adoption of the new Table of Lessons, and removed, if the recommendations of the Ritual Commission should become the law of the Church and the land. There will then, let me trust, be very few Churches in this diocese in which, not two or three only, but a goodly brotherhood of Christian worshippers, will not meet together habitually for common prayer and praise.

One more point only. I am asked what is the duty of Clergymen with respect to the dress of the Preacher in the services of the Church. On the law on this subject I do not presume to give a confident opinion. It is probable that the late Judgment, in which the point itself was not raised, did not decide it conclusively. It confirmed indeed the authority of the 58th Canon, which enjoins that "every Minister saying the public prayers or ministering the Sacraments or

other rites of the Church, shall use a decent and comely surplice ; ” but it does not determine whether *preaching*, which at the period when the Canons were passed, was often separate from the public prayers, is included among “ the other rites of the Church.” The same doubt hangs over the application to this ordinance of the term “ at all times of their ministrations ” in the Ornament Rubric of 1662 and in the Visitation Articles which so generally adopted the phrase. The Sermon or Homily, indeed, is placed in the Communion Service ; and it is a fair argument that the dress worn by the Minister in that Office was intended to be the dress of the Preacher also. That it often became so is probable : but a mere inference like this can hardly have the force of a prohibition of the black gown or other dress of the Preacher, even in the morning service, supposing such gown or other dress to be otherwise lawful ; while at other times it would be inapplicable. On the legality or illegality, then, of any other dress than the surplice I give no opinion. It might prove upon trial that the black gown was legal ; it might prove that it was illegal, or that it was illegal in the morning service and legal at other times : or it might be held that the Church has laid down no rule for the dress of the Preacher : but it is beyond doubt that the surplice *is* legal ; this vestment at least is never forbidden the Minister within the walls of his Parish Church ; in this, at all times of his ministrations, in which he is quite at liberty to

include preaching, he is safely within the law, and runs no risk of being compelled to change his practice after the irritation of a lawsuit and at the dictation of a formal decision. On this ground, although not prepared to pronounce the surplice to be the only admissible dress for the Preacher, I am anxious to counsel its adoption whenever it is found practicable. I should be glad to believe that the time was come when, on this point at least, we might advance to uniformity, and that one well-worn banner of disunion might be furled. Objections to the surplice must surely now have lost their old significance,—the echoes of an obsolete controversy. And though I do not require, or even advise, the adoption of the surplice in the pulpit when at variance with the decided feeling of the Parishioners who have the right to have even their prejudices respected when not opposed to law, I shall be very thankful to see the present diversity of practice, if it may not at once, at least gradually pass away, at a time when there are comparatively few who care to maintain it, and before the embers of the dying flame are stirred by a legal contest and a judicial sentence.

Pardon me, my Reverend Brethren, the length at which I have detained you. I have been anxious to survey with you the present position of our diocese, and the hindrances arising from its special circumstances, from the state of the law and the temper of the times and from elements of disunion existing among ourselves, to the realization and

restoration of the Parochial System amongst us, and to that great work of which the Parochial System is but a means and instrument, the united warfare of the Church against ignorance, error and sin, and the sanctification and salvation of the souls committed to our cure. This my first opportunity may be my last. Four years is a long period to count upon in the evening of life : and how many changes may have passed over the Church and ourselves in the interval ! It is certain that we shall not all meet here together again. Before the Bishop again visits this diocese some of us will have been called to render our account before the Chief Shepherd, the great Head of the Church. Oh ! in the heart-searching light which beams from that awful tribunal, how small and trivial will appear most of the cares and controversies and interests which excite and engross us now ! how infinitely important the worth of souls,—of our own souls and of those over whom we were set to watch and warn and teach and save ! No question will there be then of ceremonies and rites, however needful in these our days of weakness ; none of subtle definitions of dogma now forced upon us by the arts of error ; none of the delicate balance of the rights of Church and State which arise when a Kingdom not of the world is *in* the world. The quest will then be for the fruits of the Spirit in our own selves and in those for whom we are answerable : for believing, loving souls, washed in the tears of repentance and cleansed by the blood of the Lamb ;

for “joy, peace, long-suffering, gentleness, goodness, faith, meekness, and temperance;” above all for love, charity, which is to glow on for ever when faith and hope have faded in the light of certainty, and without which, even here, orthodoxy is dead, munificence and self-denial graceless, and the tongues of men and of angels but as sounding brass and a tinkling cymbal. O may we each stand, Brethren, in that day “accepted in the Beloved,” and enabled by His grace which has vouchsafed to work even by our feeble, imperfect, possibly erring, ministry, to present before Him the flock entrusted to us,—souls sanctified and saved—“our hope and joy and crown of rejoicing in the presence of our Lord Jesus Christ at His coming.”¹

¹ 1 Thess. ii. 19.

APPENDICES.

APPENDIX A.

STATEMENT OF SUMS VOLUNTARILY EXPENDED SINCE NOV. 1866, EXCLUSIVE OF GRANTS FROM THE BISHOP OF LONDON'S FUND.

Deaneries.	'Church Building and Restoration.	Schools,	Total.
		School Class and Mission Houses.	
Fulham	11,073	1,575	12,648
Kensington	96,670	16,390	113,060
Barnes	9,426	7,081	16,507
S. George's, Bloomsbury. .	2,000	4,500	6,500
Chelsea		2,905	2,905
Ealing	29,990	11,277	41,267
Enfield	42,319	13,944	56,263
S. George's, Hanover Square	18,505	13,830	32,335
Hampton	2,011	2,037	4,048
Harrow	23,211	8,491	31,702
S. Martin's-in-Fields . . .	1,000	4,100	5,100
S. Marylebone	25,315	21,768	47,083
Paddington	27,523	13,099	40,622
S. Pancras	30,094	14,787	44,881
Staines	4,062	1,836	5,898
Uxbridge	6,550	4,849	11,399
S. James, Westminster . .	11,712	4,500	16,212
S. John, Westminster . .	—	—	—
S. Margaret, Westminster . .	—	1,150	1,150
Newington	26,640	8,650	35,290
East City	10,000	—	10,000
West City	34,430	—	34,430
Hackney.	48,653	2,361	51,014
Islington	44,275	39,827	84,102
S. Sepulchre	27,624	9,451	37,075
Shoreditch	28,749	6,220	34,969
Spitalfields	12,164	13,075	25,239
Stepney	34,578	12,998	47,576
	608,574	240,701	849,275

APPENDIX B.

LIST OF ECCLESIASTICAL DISTRICTS FORMED IN THE DIOCESE OF LONDON FROM 1861—71.

1862.

Agar Town, S. Thomas.
 Barnsbury, S. Clement.
 Charterhouse, S. Mary.
 Gray's Inn Road, S. Jude.
 Holborn, S. Alban.
 Hornsey, Christ Church.
 Hoxton, S. Saviour.
 Islington, S. Thomas.
 Shoreditch, S. Michael.
 Westminster, Upper Garden Street, S. James the Less.
 Whitton, S. Philip & S. James.

1863.

Camden Town.
 Clapton, S. James.
 Haggerston, S. Augustine.
 " S. Chad.
 " S. Colomba.
 Hoxton, S. Andrew.
 Kentish Town.
 Kilburn, S. Mary.
 S. Pancras, Parish Chapel.
 Roxeth, Christ Church.

1864.

Bishopsgate St., All Saints.
 Brentford, Old, S. Paul.
 Bromley, S. Michael and All Angels.
 Hampstead Road, S. James.
 Hampton Hill.
 Islington, S. Michael.
 Kentish Town, S. Martin.
 Notting Hill, S. Mark.
 Nutford Place, S. Luke.
 Paddington, S. Mary Magdalene.
 Paddington, S. Michael and All Angels.
 Pimlico, S. Saviour.
 Whitechapel, Dock Street, S. Paul.

1865.

Bethnal Green, S. Paul.
 Campden Hill, S. George.
 Clerkenwell, S. Paul.
 Hackney, South, S. Michael and All Angels.
 Haggerston, S. Stephen.
 Hampstead, All Souls.
 Haverstock Hill, S. Andrew.
 Hillingdon, S. Andrew.
 Hornsey Rise, S. Mary.
 Hoxton, S. Anne.
 Hoxton, S. Mary.
 Islington, S. Bartholomew.
 Marlborough St., Great, S. John the Baptist.
 May Fair, Christ Church.
 St. Pancras, S. Saviour.
 Windmill St., Great, S. Peter.

1866.

Clapton, Upper, S. Matthew.
 Highbury, S. Saviour.
 Hornsey Road, S. Barnabas.
 Knightsbridge, Holy Trinity.
 Marylebone, S. Barnabas.
 " S. Cyprian.
 Newington, All Saints.
 Pimlico, S. Barnabas.
 Shoreditch, Holy Trinity.
 Wood Green, S. Michael.

1867.

Brockley Hill, S. Saviour.
 Brondesbury, Christ Church.
 Clay Hill, S. John the Baptist.
 Hackney, South, S. Augustine.
 Holborn, S. John the Evangelist.
 Kensington, S. Clement.
 Kensington, South, S. Peter.
 Kilburn, Holy Trinity.
 London Dock, S. Peter.
 Poplar, S. Matthias.
 Poplar, S. Stephen.

1868.

Fulham, Moore Park, S. James.
 Kensington, South, S. Stephen.
 Newington, S. Matthew.
 Paddington, S. Luke.
 Penton Street, S. Silas.
 Somers Town, Christ Church.
 Tufnell Park, S. George.

1869.

Bromley, S. Gabriel.
 Holloway West, S. David.
 Hoxton, S. Peter.
 Kensington, South, S. Augustine.
 Kentish New Town, S. Luke.

1870.

Bethnal Green, S. Barnabas.
 Hampstead, S. Stephen.
 Holloway, Upper, S. Paul.

Kilburn, S. Augustine.

Mile End Old Town, S. Luke.
 Millwall, S. Luke.
 Regent Street, S. Thomas.
 S. John the Evangelist in the East.
 Stepney, S. Benet.
 Walworth Common, S. Stephen.
 Walworth, East Street, S. Mark.

1871.

Dalston, S. Mark.
 Earl's Court, S. Matthias.
 Highbury, S. Augustine.
 Hounslow Heath, S. Paul.
 Notting Hill, S. Michael and All Angels.
 Paddington, S. Peter.
 Tollington Park, S. Anne.
 Westbourne Park, Upper, S. Philip.
 Clapton, Christ Church.

The following have since been transferred to the Diocese of Rochester.

1862 Charlton, S. Paul.
 1863 Aldborough Hatch, S. Peter.
 Lee, Holy Trinity.
 1864 Greenwich S. Paul.
 Plumstead, S. Nicholas.
 Victoria Docks, S. Mark.

1865 Lewisham, S. Stephen.
 Shooter's Hill, Christ Church.
 Stratford New Town, S. Paul.
 1866 Sydenham, Holy Trinity.
 Brockley Hill, S. Saviour.

APPENDIX C.

The whole passage is as follows :—“ Denieth that he ever did officiate with face purposely towards the East, but he constantly stood at the North side or end of the Table to read and perform all parts of the Communion Service there : saving that the bread and wine being usually placed in the middle of the Table, which is about 7 foot in length, he might haply do as others did there before him (though he remembereth not to have done so this 12 years) and step to the former part thereof to consecrate and bless which otherwise he could not conveniently reach.”

Acts of the High Commission Court within the Diocese of Durham. Appendix A, 218. Surtees Society.

